

The LUTHERAN C H U R C H QUARTERLY

VOLUME XX

JULY, 1947

NUMBER 3

THE FUNCTION OF CREEDS AND CONFESSIONS IN THE CHURCH

By Theodore G. Tappert

FERVENT IN SPIRIT

By John Aberly

IS THE SOUTH LESS CHRISTIAN IN RACE RELATIONS?

By John R. Brokhoff

HOW CHRISTIAN IS THE NORTH IN RACE RELATIONS?

By Dwight F. Putman

NEGRO LUTHERAN WORK IN NEW YORK

By Harry J. Kreider

ECCLESIASTICAL ORDERS IN AMERICAN COLONIAL
LUTHERANISM

By Robert Fortenbaugh

LUTHER'S SERMON ON THE WORTHY RECEPTION OF
THE LORD'S SUPPER

Translated by A. B. Lentz

Beside the Well *By Zoltán Túróczy*

The Significance of the Old Testament for Our Faith . . . *By Emil Brunner*

Is Bach Music Lutheran? *By Emanuel W. Hammer*

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

TIMES AND NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY

GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

CONTENTS FOR JULY

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE	234
--------------------------------------	-----

ARTICLES

THE FUNCTION OF CREEDS AND CONFESSIONS IN THE CHURCH.	
<i>By Theodore G. Tappert</i>	235
FERVENT IN SPIRIT. <i>By John Aberly</i>	243
IS THE SOUTH LESS CHRISTIAN IN RACE RELATIONS? <i>By John R. Brokhoff</i>	247
HOW CHRISTIAN IS THE NORTH IN RACE RELATIONS? <i>By Dwight F. Putman</i>	253
NEGRO LUTHERAN WORK IN NEW YORK. <i>By Harry J. Kreider</i>	261
ECCLESIASTICAL ORDERS IN AMERICAN COLONIAL LUTHERANISM.	
<i>By Robert Fortenbaugh</i>	274
LUTHER'S SERMON ON THE WORTHY RECEPTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.	
<i>Translated by A. B. Lentz</i>	297

NOTES AND STUDIES

BESIDE THE WELL. <i>By Zoltán Túróczy</i>	304
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR OUR FAITH. <i>By Emil Brunner</i>	330
IS BACH MUSIC LUTHERAN? <i>By Emanuel W. Hammer</i>	344

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS

Heim, <i>A Harmony of the Gospels</i> (E. E. Flack)	351
Frankfort, Wilson, Jacobsen, Irwin, <i>The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man: An Essay on Speculative Thought in the Ancient Near East</i> (J. M. Myers)	352
Brunner, <i>Revelation and Reason</i> (M. J. Heineken)	354
Thelen, <i>Man as Sinner in Contemporary American Realistic Theology</i>	
(T. A. Kantonen)	357
Billheimer, <i>What Must the Church Do?</i> (Harvey D. Hoover)	358
Fricke, <i>We Found Them Waiting</i> (John Aberly)	358
Boyer, <i>Everyman's Adventure</i> (Harvey D. Hoover)	359
Walker and Schroedel, <i>Greater Love Hath No Man</i> (R. Bornemann)	360

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY

Editors

Theodore G. Tappert
Paul J. Hoh
Philadelphia

Harvey D. Hoover
Raymond T. Stamm
Gettysburg

Volume XX

JULY, 1947

Number 3

Published quarterly by the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly* (founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849) and *The Lutheran Church Review* (founded in Philadelphia in 1882). Entered at the Gettysburg Post Office as second-class matter.

Indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Subscription \$2.50 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents. Subscriptions and all business communications should be addressed to Professor Harvey D. Hoover, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Manuscripts, books for review, and other editorial correspondence should be addressed to Professor Theodore G. Tappert, 7333 Germantown Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The aims of THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY are (1) to give intellectual expressions to the faith of the United Lutheran Church in America as set forth in its doctrinal basis, to maintain that faith, and to show constantly its relation to the practical religious living of those who hold it; (2) to promote cordial understandings between the bodies of Lutherans, both in America and Europe, and between Lutheran and other Christian groups; (3) to discuss, in a constructive and helpful manner, the relation of the faith of the Lutheran Church to the religious issues involved in contemporary life and thought.

The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they shall be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they shall be free from controversial animus; and that their contents shall be of real scholarly and practical value to the reader. THE LUTHERAN CHURCH QUARTERLY shall be conducted with due regard for the Christian liberty which proves all things and holds fast that which is good, and for which the Lutheran Church has always stood. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, will not of itself exclude articles from publication, since the editors will not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors. The editors reserve the right to reject any article without assigning a reason for their action.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

JOHN ABERLY, president and professor of Systematic Theology in the Gettysburg Seminary from 1926-1940, and author of *An Outline of Missions*, writes concerning the qualifications for the ministry on the basis of his many years as missionary, teacher and administrator.

JOHN R. BROKHOFF is pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, Atlanta, Georgia.

DWIGHT F. PUTMAN is pastor of Christ Lutheran Church, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

HARRY J. KREIDER, pastor of St. James Church in Ozone Park, New York, is chairman of the New York Synod's Committee on Documentary History.

ROBERT FORTENBAUGH, professor and head of the Department of History in Gettysburg College, and president of the Pennsylvania Historical Association, delivered the Holman Lecture for 1947 at the Gettysburg Seminary.

A. B. LENTZ, who has translated Luther's Sermon on the Worthy Reception of the Lord's Supper, is in the rural pastorate of Christ Lutheran Church at Louisville, Nebraska. In May of this year he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from Midland College and Western Seminary.

JOHN L. E. DE PAPP is pastor of Our Saviour Magyar Evangelical Lutheran Church, Buffalo, New York. He was assisted in his translation of Bishop Túróczy's lectures on Evangelization by his daughter Ildikó de Papp, and by Miss Emmy Kovács. He characterizes these lectures as examples of present-day Hungarian theological writing, which "is an inexhaustible source of clear, inspirational thinking, and pure, determined Lutheran theology, the use of which, in my opinion, is not only indispensable, but an imperative necessity in today's befuddled Christian world."

C. UMHAU WOLF, formerly chaplain and pastor in Ohio, and now professor of Old Testament Interpretation at the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Illinois, has made the translation of Emil Brunner's article on "The Significance of the Old Testament for Our Faith."

EMANUEL W. HAMMER is Protestant chaplain at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Northport, Long Island, New York. He has served parishes in Greenbrook, Hudson and Lynbrook, New York, and in Meriden, Connecticut.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are E. E. FLACK, professor of Biblical Literature and dean of Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; J. M. MEYERS, professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Literature and Theology in the Gettysburg Seminary; M. J. HEINECKEN, professor of Dogmatics, Ethics and Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary; T. A. KANTONEN, professor of Dogmatics and Systematic Theology in Hamma Divinity School; HARVEY D. HOOVER, professor of Practical Theology in Gettysburg Seminary; CLAUDE E. SCHICK, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and R. BORNEMANN, instructor in Greek in the Philadelphia Seminary.

THE FUNCTION OF CREEDS AND CONFESSIONS IN THE CHURCH

THEODORE G. TAPPERT
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

IT IS possible to distinguish three major positions which churches have taken with respect to creeds and confessions. (1) Some hold that such symbols are absolutely necessary and have absolute authority. This is the position notably of the Roman Church, which officially requires adherence to "all and every one of the things" contained in its creedal formulations on the ground that they are identical with the unchangeable truth of God. Any deviation is consequently branded as sin, and excommunication necessarily follows such deviation. (2) Others hold that symbols are relatively necessary and have limited authority. This is the position of most of the Reformation churches, which have taken pains to distinguish between the divine authority of the Scriptures and the derived, ecclesiastical authority of creeds and confessions. Deviation from the latter is not branded as sin, and such excommunication as may follow in extreme cases is thought of in terms of exclusion from the fellowship of a particular church and not exclusion from the universal church. (3) Still others hold that such symbols are unnecessary and have no authority at all. This position has been taken by churches on principle or as a result of historical conflict either with the content of or with the authority ascribed to prevailing creeds and confessions. Just as the motives have been various, so the degree of opposition has varied from an irenic indifference to symbols as unnecessary, to a polemical repudiation of them as unchristian and sinful.

The following discussion is an attempt to set forth a position which falls within the second of the above categories.

I. THE FUNCTION OF CREEDS

One function of creeds and confessions is *to express the common faith of the church*. That the members of a church should have some things in common may be taken to be axiomatic, for a religious fellowship without common possessions is inconceivable. These possessions are of many different kinds. However, at the heart of the Christian fellowship are not only common actions, but above all common convictions out of which these common actions flow. As most Christians apprehend them, these convictions are in their essence responses to God's revelation of Himself, principally in Jesus Christ, and accordingly they are responses to a Person and not to intellectual concepts.

In so far as these convictions are real and vital, they are inevitably expressed, and, humanly speaking, their expression is necessary for the life and growth of the church. For as long as they remain unexpressed, or are expressed only in solitary devotions before God, no fellowship results, no church comes into being. But as soon as the convictions are witnessed before men and some men come to like convictions, a spiritual fellowship, the church, becomes alive and grows. This witness has always taken a variety of forms. In earliest times it took the form of following Jesus. Later it sometimes took the form of martyrdom. Both then and since it has taken the form of conduct which has reflected certain underlying convictions. It has always taken the form of words too. The New Testament documents are themselves the earliest extant written records of such verbal testimony. In later ages similar testimony was occasionally epitomized in creeds and confessions. And to the extent to which these creedal and confessional formulations have been embraced at a given time, they have expressed the common faith of that church.

A second function of creeds and confessions is *to preserve the unity of the church*. This is simply a corollary of the first. Anything that expresses the common faith of the church is, or of itself becomes, a bond of fellowship, an external evidence of the unity of the church.

As a matter of fact, it was the original purpose of each one of the creeds and confessions to unite rather than to divide. All creed-producing ages have been times of conflicting beliefs. Differences were sharply dividing men in the church and threatening its unity. Statements were then formulated in an attempt to forestall disruption or to preserve at least the remnants of unity. These statements did not introduce the divisions. They came after the differences and consequent divisions, not before them. In most cases the decision reached was to adopt one of several alternative convictions. The adoption of one implied (and usually stated) the rejection of the other alternatives. Thus unity (and it was always relative rather than complete unity) was preserved by affirming what was thought compatible, and rejecting what was thought incompatible, with the Christian fellowship, by including the one and excluding the other. Since every fellowship is by nature exclusive, if there be any quarrel, it can hardly be with exclusion but must be with the grounds on which exclusion was carried out.

A third function of creeds and confessions is *to exhibit the continuity of the church*. Generally speaking, creedless churches have laid far less emphasis on the continuity of the church from the first century to the present than have churches with creeds. In some cases creedless churches have, in fact, virtually ignored the historical development of the church in their effort to "restore primitive Christianity." On the other hand, churches which have retained creeds and confessions have kept them because they have been conscious of unbroken fellowship with the church of the ages, and at the same time these symbols have been constant reminders to them of this continuity. The creeds and confessions themselves usually claim to stand in this long tradition. By calling itself apostolic, the so-called Apostles' Creed identifies itself with the apostolic church of the New Testament, and the Reformation confessions quite uniformly reaffirm the ancient creeds and at the same time claim to be in harmony with the Scriptures. Thus the later formulations profess to be amplifications of earlier ones for the purpose of meeting new issues. (A good example of this is the exposition

of the second article of the Apostles' Creed in Luther's Small Catechism, which "amplifies" the Creed so as to include Reformation emphases.)

While exhibiting the continuity of the church, therefore, creeds and confessions also reflect its development. When the ancient creeds are placed beside the Reformation confessions, for example, it becomes clear that the continuity is not a static but a developing one. And to acknowledge development between the fourth and the sixteenth centuries is to acknowledge that there has also been development since the last of the confessions was formulated. But this does not mean that they have no value for us today. It means only that, because they are historical documents, they must be interpreted historically. To accept them today does not require that we share the climate of opinion or the method or argument or the mode of expression which were characteristic of bygone ages. Most of us cannot do so. But to embrace historical statements as our own means that, in view of the issues which were then involved and the alternatives which were then offered, we take our stand with those whose faith is there expressed. We declare that, in this historical context, the decisions were and are valid, and in so doing we place ourselves in the developing continuity of the church of the ages.

A fourth function of creeds and confessions is *to safeguard the future of the church*. If a line of continuity can be traced through the church's past, presumably it can be projected into the future too. And the church is deeply concerned about maintaining in the present and transmitting to the future what has given it its distinctive life as a Christian fellowship, what alone can enable it to fulfill its mission in the world. What this is has been expressed most compendiously in its creeds and confessions. Accordingly some kind of commitment to them is required of all members. As a rule the Apostles' Creed, as the simplest and most timeless of the historical creeds, is used for this purpose—in connection with baptism and confirmation, and also in the public services of the church.

Not less significant is the obligation of the clergy, which nor-

mally goes beyond simple creedal forms to embrace later and more inclusive confessional declarations. Because of their responsible position of leadership, the clergy are expected to have a fuller knowledge of the historical landmarks of a church's developing understanding of the revelation of God in Christ. They are also expected to embrace the interpretation of this revelation, set forth therein, as their own. This requirement is made on the ground that the clergy are called, not to speak for themselves only, but to speak for the church; not to conduct open forums on religion, but to be ministers of a Gospel. If they are to exercise a ministry within a fellowship which has a common understanding of this Gospel, and which exists to proclaim, apply, and spread it, they must be willing to subscribe the common creeds and confessions which, properly interpreted, express this understanding. By such commitment to creedal and confessional standards, the future of the church is in some measure safeguarded.

II. THE INTERPRETATION OF CREEDS

No discussion of the use of historical creeds and confessions can in honesty overlook the very real and thorny problems connected with their interpretation. Clergymen, in particular, have had scruples of conscience about obligating themselves to teach and preach in accordance with standards which they could not conscientiously embrace in their entirety. Some of the major difficulties confronting them can be touched upon very briefly.

(1) Much can be made of the unedifying circumstances attending the origin of some of the symbols, but in themselves these do not destroy their present value, for the authority of the symbols does not rest on such circumstances but on their inherent truth. (2) The compulsion which was sometimes resorted to in an effort to secure conformity should likewise be ascribed to mistaken notions of faith (reliance on doctrines rather than on God) and to the intolerance which prevailed in other ages. Such abuses do not render a proper use of symbols impossible. (3) More important than such difficulties are others which are inherent in the docu-

ments themselves, and among these are problems growing out of the form of the symbols. The terminology of the fourth or of the sixteenth century is not that of today. Words which clearly expressed the deepest convictions of contemporaries may convey a different meaning, or perhaps no meaning, to our generation. Such difficulties can be overcome only by historical study, and such study is not too high a price to pay for loyalty to the church of the past. (4) However, loyalty to the church of the present is quite as important, and here we are confronted by problems of content. Many symbols contain a discussion of topics (like the assertion that the pope is antichrist) which may no longer seem to be relevant. On the other hand, some things which are of great concern to the church today (like the missionary obligation and function of the church) are not even alluded to in passing. More than that, most symbols, especially the longer ones, contain errors of fact or interpretation or both which betray the limitations of the ages which produced them. As a consequence the historical creeds and confessions may appear to be too inflexible to express the faith of the church or to provide a norm for its clergymen in view of the constant change and growth of knowledge and experience.

To meet such difficulties, and especially the last, revision of the historical standards has often been proposed and occasionally undertaken. This is a dubious procedure, however, because the symbols are historical documents and (like the documents included in the New Testament) ought not to be tampered with. Besides, a revision of old symbols would silence the testimony to us of the church in the ages which produced them, and one of their functions would thereby be lost.

In addition to the revision of old symbols, the preparation of a new confession for our day, to place alongside the older symbols, has sometimes been proposed. This would be in keeping with the traditional practice of the church and might be desirable but for the generally unsettled condition of the church today which would make the venture hazardous.

Instead of revising the old standards or devising new ones,

it is possible to meet the difficulties by adjusting the terms of subscription. In this way the historical creeds and confessions can be interpreted both in the light of history and in the light of their present meaning in the church. By accommodating them to the church's developing understanding, they can continue to be used as instruments which express and safeguard the common faith of the church. This can be achieved by substituting for a formula which implies, if it does not state, "I subscribe the Lutheran Confessions and all things therein contained as agreeable to the Word of God," a more realistic form of subscription, perhaps something like this: "I do willingly affirm and from my heart believe that the teaching of the Lutheran Church, as witnessed in its Confessions, is agreeable to the Word of God." Some such formula would appear to express the proper relationship between the living church and its testimonies in history without jeopardizing the true continuity of its faith.

In the interest of church union it has often been suggested that all the traditional symbols be abandoned and that churches acknowledge the Scriptures alone as a sufficient standard. This suggestion cannot be expected to achieve the desired goal because there are important differences in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and it is these differences, not the symbols which record them, which are stumbling blocks in the way of a union of the churches. Others have suggested abandoning the later confessions and acknowledging the so-called ecumenical creeds of the "undivided church" as sufficient standards. But actually these creeds are not ecumenical, and never have been. Moreover, words and phrases in even the simplest of these creeds are differently understood: *credo* (assent to doctrine or trust in God), *communio sanctorum* (fellowship in the sacraments or communion of believers), *resurrectio carnis* (resurrection of a material or of a spiritual body), *una sancta ecclesia* (a visible or the invisible church), etc. To use the same words and mean different things by them will scarcely offer a solution to the problem of church union. Similarly evasive is the further proposal to substitute for Scriptures and

creeds the simple confession of Peter, "[I believe that] Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." By themselves these few words no longer easily convey the full burden of what they meant to Peter, and the variety of interpretation given to them today highlights the want of agreement. If a way is to be found out of existing differences, it must be sought by facing them and not concealing them, and as long as fundamental differences remain, creeds and confessions will continue to express them.

FERVENT IN SPIRIT¹

JOHN ABERLY
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

A SHORT time ago I was asked to give what I considered the qualifications of a Christian missionary. My reply was that he ought to know his subject, be he preacher, teacher, physician, agriculturalist, industrialist or welfare worker; that he ought to be able to adapt himself to people and circumstances; and, this I would emphasize, that he ought to be a person who has found in Christ something that has proved so valuable, and that he is convinced is so needed by others, that he feels constrained to make it known to them.

If there be any virtue in such an answer, a further question suggests itself. Is this after all not what every preacher and teacher of the gospel ought to covet? It is often said and heard that there is very little difference between what used to be known as Christian and non-Christian lands and their people. Our supreme idolatry now is nationalism and secularism. It is the god of this world, be it gain or pleasure, at whose shrine men everywhere bow. And so, whether at home or abroad, the need is the same. It is a conviction that what one has found in Christ must be shared with all men.

Only as one has such a conviction can one speak with that earnestness that Apollos had at Corinth, which Paul puts among the graces that he would have the Christians at Rome strive after. We are told that in our day certain sects—Jehovah's Witnesses, Holiness Movements, etc., are adding more members to their groups than are the more proper but more restrained communions. As I listen to their messages as they come over the radio, I can not but appreciate the earnestness with which they speak. They often make one feel as did the agnostic who delighted to hear the great

¹ Rom. 8:11; cf. Acts 18:25.

Spurgeon. When some one expressed surprise that the agnostic should go to hear a message that he himself did not believe, he said, "But Spurgeon believes it!"

Coming then to what men have found and may find in Christ, that men need, let us remind ourselves of what some of these treasures are. In spite of the fact that theology is not venerated as it once was as the queen of sciences, it may yet be helpful, and also help to enthrone theology again in its high position, if we are guided in our selection of such values by connecting them with the theologies that they have shaped.

The first then that may be mentioned is the peace that believers have always found in Jesus. It is the evidence from experience, but the main emphasis should not be on the experience itself but on that which is experienced. It unifies life. The word sin has almost disappeared from our vocabularies. Men now speak of maladjustments. In his book on *Religious Perplexities*, Principal Jacks speaks of the courageous life as one that is based on the conviction that there is kindness, friendliness, at the heart of the universe. What he states abstractly, we have concretely in Christ Jesus. In man's loneliness Christ is the Friend always present. In suffering he is our Peace. He is the ever-present Companion. Those who have found him such, and who find this their most precious possession, how can they help but tell others of it? Especially as they see how men in our day turn to psychiatry to find just that which he is ready to give to all who commit themselves to him: "Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you," is still his benediction to those who follow him.

Ever since reconciliation has been understood with Ritschl, the emphasis has been not so much on the personal, as on the social. This is no less, perhaps in our day even more, to be stressed and proclaimed. In his Kingdom, service is the law. The greatest among you shall be your servant. Even as he came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give his life a ransom—could this but be made actual in this distracted world, would not the ills of our time be healed?

These are the values that theology emphasized since the Enlightenment, following the systems of Schleiermacher and Ritschl respectively. But since the first World War, there has been a marked return to the Theology of the Reformation. This does not exclude the above. Nor does it overlook what is at present chiefly singled out for emphasis by not a few. A recent writer on the story of the Faith would seem to eliminate the gospel and confine himself to the ethical teachings as expressed chiefly in the Sermon on the Mount. While regretting such a one-sided view of the Faith, it must yet be recognized that the ethical teachings of Jesus are an integral part of the gospel. The same may be said of the many who present Jesus as our great Example but not as a Saviour from sin. He is our Example, so that the New Testament always refers every problem of conduct to him for its solution. He is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

But the Reformation put chief emphasis on him as Saviour from sin, here and hereafter. It has been said, and is often repeated, that the modern man does not bother about his sins. If he does not, certainly the world suffers from them. The gospel is a message of forgiveness. In the very center of its holiest service are enshrined the words, "Given and shed for you, for the remission of sins." With this, let it be remembered that it is no cheap pardon that is offered to us. It has been purchased with a price, even the precious blood of Christ. The faith that lays hold of and appropriates it to itself identifies itself with the crucified in an acknowledgment that this is the desert of my sin. The church has been called the community of the forgiven. To this must be added that in the very fact of its accepting forgiveness, it becomes also the community of the forgiving, and this is the way to peace, individual, social, national, international. There is no hope of attaining it in any other way. It was this that Paul found in Christ, and it made him the fervent apostle to the Gentiles. It was the grace of God manifested in a forgiveness that cost, that inspired the Reformers and made them the heralds of a new era in the church. It is the

supreme value in Christ which we need to recover if our peace, the peace of the world, is to be assured.

At the outset, the statement was made that in order to be earnest in the work of the ministry, the great need is the conviction that in Christ we have that which is of supreme worth, and which all men need. If any one of the values listed here can so inspire one who has really laid hold of them, what ought a conviction that all of these treasures are found in Christ not to do for those who go out to proclaim him? The very greatness of their glory would make us very humble and lead us to ask with the Apostle, "Who is sufficient for these things?" But with the same Apostle we too may say, "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God."

IS THE SOUTH LESS CHRISTIAN IN RACE RELATIONS?

JOHN R. BROKHOFF
Atlanta, Georgia

“IT couldn’t happen here!” This is the decided retort of practically every Christian below the Mason and Dixon line after seeing the pictures and reading the accompanying article, “No Color Line” in *The Lutheran* of May 15, 1946. The pictures showed, and the article explained, a unique bi-racial congregation in New York City whose pastor brought together Negroes and Whites for worship and fellowship.

No, it could not happen down South. Does that mean that the South is less Christian than the North? How is it possible, many Northerners ask, that the Christians in the South can have such an unchristian attitude and still comprise the section of the land known as the Bible-belt and have perhaps the highest percentage of the population as faithful church attendants? Many people, not understanding the Southern Christians, conclude that, in spite of these facts, they are less Christian than other sections of the nation.

Certain facts tend to persuade one to think that the South is less Christian. There is the fact, for instance, of the apparent hypocrisy of Southern Christians when faced with the race problem. Many wonder how they can believe in the brotherhood of man and then fail to follow through with corresponding conduct. Such folks consider them arch-hypocrites when they urge their fellow-man to love one another as Jesus loved and then refuse to sit beside a colored Christian in church. The Editor of *The Lutheran* expressed this accusation when he asked a Luther League convention, “Aren’t we aware that this is a shocking exhibition of insincerity as Christian disciples?” A reporter of the Southern Presbyterian General Assembly in May, 1946, was impressed with a similar situation among the delegates to the convention. He reports a very

impressive morning church service when the Lord's Supper was administered. Immediately afterwards he watched them file in for their midday meal. He saw a little group of Negro men enter the inn by a *back* door and sit at a *separate* table. He noticed one or two white delegates, apparently bothered by their consciences, leave their white companions to eat at the same table with the colored men just as they received together the Lord's Supper.

The people of the South seem to be less Christian, moreover, because they deny their colored citizens the right of voting. The poll tax is almost non-existent today, but the determination to keep Negroes from voting has not diminished. Senator Bilbo of Mississippi was returned to the Senate on the platform of Negro-hatred. Eugene Talmadge of Georgia based his entire race for governor on the racial issue. Openly he told the Negroes not to vote for him. He promised, if elected, to return the white primary. This was done under the leadership of his son, Herman. And Talmadge was elected to the highest office of the state on that un-democratic and unchristian platform! It is natural to ask how the Christians of the South, if truly sincere, could endure such injustice without protest.

Then, too, there is the fact of segregation that casts doubt on the Christianity of the people of the South. In the Spring of 1946 the Federal Council of Churches called upon the churches to end racial segregation within the church. The Southern Church heard the resolution, but all she did was smile in amusement at the passage of such an impossible manifesto. The Southern Church is not at present willing to mix both races for worship or service. The feeling is so intense that, for example, the citizens of Columbus, Georgia, in May of 1946 abandoned efforts to organize a Y.W.C.A. in their city when the national Y.W. demanded that the Board of Directors include both black and white women. Segregation is the law of the land in the South. Persons of the two races, by state law, dare not sit on the same seat together while on a public conveyance. They refuse to eat together either in the same room or at the same table. They usually do not use the same entrances and exits. Nor

will they share the same drinking fountains. Christians in other parts of the nation are amazed that Southern Christians can treat their fellowmen in this exclusive way and still want to be called Christians.

Well, is the South less Christian? After living eight years in the South, I am persuaded that Southern Christians are just as Christian as those in any other part of the country. There are several reasons for holding this conviction. One reason is, Southern Christians believe, with other Christians, in the equality of the Negro. They think the Negro should have equal rights and privileges as a human being, as a child of God, and as a citizen of the U.S.A. He along with all Americans should have the right to vote, to receive fair wages according to the quality and quantity of his work, and to receive justice in the courts. They further believe that the Negro has equal access to God, for God is no respecter of persons. His soul is as precious to God as any white man's. These beliefs are the same as held by all true Christians.

Ideally the Southern Christian holds the Negro to be equal, as to his rights and his relationship to God, but practically he is not equal, not because he happens to be black, but because all persons have gifts and talents to a greater or less degree of importance. In the political area, intelligent Southern Christians agree that the Negro has the right to vote. For this reason most Southern pulpits condemn the practice of basing a political race on racial animosity. But, the real problem is whether the Negro is qualified to vote. Is he literate? Does he have an understanding of government and democracy to vote intelligently, or will he sell his vote to the politician who can arouse his emotions or fears? Many a Southern Negro, at this time, cannot fulfill these requirements.

Economically the Southern Christian believes the Negro should get paid according to his ability. That is traditional American economics. Why does the Southern Negro have such a low income? Because, generally, his ability cannot earn more. Only the Southerner knows the type of service rendered by the average Negro. He is slower than a tortoise. He often is found sleeping on

the job. He has little initiative, and can assume very little responsibility. Thrift and diligence are unknown qualities among many of them. Of course, there is a certain group not included in this description, but we are talking here of the "average." Thus, his wages are not equal to the white man's because most of the time he does not deserve any more.

How can Southern Christians believe in the equality of the Negroes and at the same time practice segregation? To Southern Christians social relationships are not a matter of a right but a matter of personal choice. It is not a matter of equality, but a matter of whom you wish to associate and live with. White people naturally want to be with white people, and the black people want to associate with their own race. We are wrong to compliment ourselves by thinking the colored people want our company. Our presence may be as distasteful to them as their presence would be to us. Accordingly, inter-marriage and all social contacts are frowned upon. Each race in the South wants its own churches, schools, housing, and recreation facilities. And here is a fact few Northerners know: the Southern Negro has little respect for the white person who crosses the color line and tries to pal with him. The Washington News-Digest gives an account of a visit of the great Abolitionist, Wendell Phillips, to Charleston, South Carolina. He stopped at a hotel, and the next morning a slave served him his breakfast. Mr. Phillips took advantage of the occasion to assure the colored man that he regarded him as a man and brother. The Negro was more concerned about serving the breakfast than his social position. Finally the Abolitionist became discouraged and told the servant to leave because he did not want to be waited upon by a slave. "You must excuse me," said the Negro, "I am obliged to stay here 'cause I'm responsible for the silverware." Because of tradition and wisdom in race relations, the Southern Christian wants to live side by side with the Negro, who shall have the same rights, privileges, and advantages that he himself enjoys.

The South is not any less Christian because, in the second place, Southern Christians have a brotherly love for the Negro.

The average Southern Christian has a genuine love for the colored person. This may sound contradictory after explaining the custom of segregation. Nevertheless it is a fact that the Southerner has a benevolent attitude toward the Negro. This love is expressed in social welfare for the Negro. The white Christians have taken the initiative in providing most of the privileges the Negroes now enjoy. The individual white Southern Christian expresses his love with gifts, loans of money, little kindnesses, consideration of his needs, and friendliness. Sometimes the colored servant is loved as much as a member of the family. When a servant has been working for a family for a number of years, he becomes indispensable and cherished. It is not uncommon to see a colored servant sit with the bereaved immediate family at a funeral service.

Because of this Christian attitude of brotherly love and concern, the South has been able to handle the racial problem successfully. For many years both races have been living side by side in harmony and comparative contentment. For this reason the South resents the North advising it how to handle the racial problem. The South wishes to emphasize that the problem is not a Southern problem, but a national problem. It is a problem of animosity, fear, hatred, and prejudice. These prevail in the North as well as in the South. The benevolent attitude of the Southern Christian is evidence of the fact that he is a true Christian. Therefore, future race relations throughout the country depend upon the continuing influence of the church as the producer of love and goodwill in all men.

The Christians of the South might be described as progressives rather than perfectionists in this matter of race relations. The perfectionist Christian demands that the ideal Christian society shall come in a day, while the progressive Christian thinks it will take a little longer. It is the perfectionist who points his accusing finger at the Southern Church and calls it sub-Christian.

Southern Christians hold fast to the ideals of the Kingdom of God. The Southern pulpits preach vigorously against racial intolerance and prejudice. They extol the divine Fatherhood and ex-

plain that all men are brothers regardless of the color of skin. No, there is no muffing of the Word of God in the South. But the Southern Christians believe that these ideals can be attained gradually through the years.

Christians of the Southland know many things are not Christian about the colored question. But they believe that the Negro eventually will have every advantage of the white. Thirteen million colored people cannot be permanently subordinated under white supremacy, regardless of Bilbo and Talmadge. Freedom and justice will eventually be granted to all minorities in our country and in the world as the Christian conscience is enlightened. Accordingly, the Southern Church boldly condemns the racial issue as a means of getting votes for political election. It insists that every man shall be paid according to his ability and need. Segregation is gradually being broken down in Christian circles as a prelude for its total breakdown. Here and there in the South ministerial associations are becoming bi-racial and both races come together for special occasions. Today this is an exception to the rule, but in the not too distant future it will be the general rule.

The wisdom of the Southern Christian is to let this racial issue work itself out in response to the gospel. To rush it and push it means racial rioting. If the church is true to the gospel, the customs of men will eventually conform. The racial question is a matter to be handled within the minds and hearts of men. While the leaven of the gospel is working, we need the graces of patience and tolerance. Most wonderful progress in the colored issue has been made since 1865, and similar progress toward perfect equality should be made before the twentieth century closes. A churchman of the South aptly sums up the matter with these words, "Men in other sections can little appreciate the nature of the racial problem, but there are men here in the South who are trying to solve that problem and one of these days it will be solved."

HOW CHRISTIAN IS THE NORTH IN RACE RELATIONS?

DWIGHT F. PUTMAN
Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

IT IS the purpose of this article neither to precipitate nor to promote a second War between the States. But Pastor Brokhoff's treatment of the race problem, as a Southerner, does prompt a kind of died-in-the-wool Northerner like myself to want to pick up the ball where he leaves it and advance it nearer the goal. Obviously it is far better to use the figure of the ball rather than bullets or names in working toward a solution of this particular issue. For this is altogether a friendly engagement in which the two of us are not really opposing each other but rather playing on the same side against a very stubborn opposition.

Perhaps it should be understood at the very outset that in this game, which constitutes a tough struggle, we players can all be charged at one time or another with a great deal of fumbling of the ball. The pastor of Redeemer Church of Atlanta does make some good plays. His hopeful outlook for victory must be appreciated, even though it be a long postponed one as he sees it; for there is manifested a genuine desire for its ultimate achievement. Yet here and there his play does seem to give evidence of being a bit weak and not aggressive enough for a strong Christian athlete.

It is my desire not to take advantage of any of his fumbles to run against him—we are on the same team—nor yet to cover them up for him, but to go into a huddle and have the chance to say, "Our game is very spotty; we fumble the ball on the offense, and our defense is woefully weak." If my good fellow player so desires, I hope he may find further opportunity to take a later run at this matter, and perhaps together we can prepare the way a little better for the speedier march of Christian ideals into the field of race relations.

In that spirit and to that end let us now consider certain phases of the racial problem raised by Pastor Brokhoff in his article, "Is the South less Christian in Race Relations?" Unless otherwise assigned the quoted parts which follow are from that article.

"Southern Christians believe, with other Christians, in the equality of the Negro. They think the Negro should have equal rights and privileges as a human being, as a child of God, and as a citizen of the U.S.A." Well, Southern Christians may believe this, but Northern Christians don't. They will say they do but they don't. They make a great ado of quoting to this point from the foundation documents of their country. They may draw also upon their religious creeds and sacred writings in support of it. But in reality they don't believe it. Their extensive theoretical confession on this point is a favorite technique employed for bringing conscience to terms with an existing unconscionable situation in racial relationships. No, the North is less Christian than that in its race relations.

We of the North go shouting all over God's earth and heaven about the equality of men. Ah, what a run we make at this business of equality! But in the parts in which I have ever lived we certainly do fumble the ball of "opportunity." Paraphrasing the language of St. Paul, we say, "But opportunity for Negroes, let it not once be named among us as becometh American whites." I am speaking about the North, now, which I know at least in part, though lively suspicions also assail me with respect to the situation in the South. One is struck by the fact that opportunity is not once named in Pastor Brokhoff's article. Rights and privileges, yes. But what about the chance for a man to exercise and enjoy such great blessings to which he is admittedly entitled? Yet I would not level undue criticism on this score at one writing out of the South, because we of the North don't mention these things much either. We don't actually want the Negro to have equal opportunity with ourselves in order that he may enjoy this equality of which we speak. It may be that "the Southern Christian wants to live side by side with the Negro, who shall have the same rights, privileges, and advantages

that he himself enjoys," but I can truthfully say that the average Northern Christian does not want that. The North is less Christian than that in its race relations.

Of course the Negro can be charged with illiteracy. And, if for that reason he becomes a voting risk anywhere for society, whose fault is it in a completely white-dominated and controlled social order than he has remained as illiterate as he is. Even, in this very moment, one hears opposition being voiced to a proposed federal appropriation for public education in the states because of the condition attached that expenditures shall be equalized for all pupils, thereby violating a traditional discrimination practiced in many places of providing inferior educational facilities for Negroes.

Admittedly the Negro has not the ability to take his place in our competitive economic life and earn an income equal to that of the average white man. Here in the North we do not relish competition on the part of other racial groups in the economic field. We were anxious to import into America south European, Asiatic, African, and Mexican labor so long as it served our economic interests, but the moment it threatened to enter into competition with us we passed exclusion acts, refused citizenship, denied opportunity, and shackled these groups with all kinds of social, economic, and political bonds so they might not be able to stand up and run with us.

Also, "Here is a fact that few Northerners know: the Southern Negro has little respect for the white person who crosses the color line and tries to pal with him." That same reasoning is employed by some of my Northern friends, I have always thought, as an excuse for their never venturing near the color line. I assume that when they refer to keeping the Negro in his place they mean to hold inviolate this sharp line of demarcation on the basis of color.

No doubt if anyone be willing to give it a try he will find that situation different here in the North. At least that has been my personal experience in my own relationships with a number of Negroes, some of whom once lived in the South. In all my excursions across the color line, everyone has always seemed quite happy

about it except, on occasion, some of my good white friends who themselves never get near the line. I find, also, that it works with Southern Negroes when living in the North. In fact, I am convinced through my own limited experience of fraternization with the Negro that he likes that sort of thing more than anything else that can happen between us. All that is demanded for success in such relationship is that I come clean across this notorious color line, carrying with me no patronizing air, and bringing a heart freed from the awful poison of an indwelling consciousness of white superiority.

Realizing that I am one of those Northerners who know too little about the South and its problems, I was interested in discovering how Negroes who do know the South and can express themselves feel about this matter. One fine considerate Negro minister from the South, but at present serving in the North, was most emphatic in his denial of the statement that the Negro of the South has little respect for a white man who would make such approach to him. By correspondence I addressed this matter to a very highly educated and cultured Negro minister who has served congregations in many sections and who is at present in the South. His reply in part was: "I do not hesitate to say it is grossly untrue. The fact is that wherever and whenever the white man plays fair with the Negro and gives him decent treatment he (the white man) is highly respected." He had still more interesting things to say in general on this question of the race problem, but this is not the occasion to relate them and I must also respect his confidence expressed in me when in conclusion he said, "I tell you these things confidentially, for I am in the South, and one is assailed without warning."

Again, "Southern Christians have a brotherly love for the Negro . . . the Southerner has a benevolent attitude toward the Negro." Once more, I don't know about the South, but I do know that in regard to this business of brotherly love the North is less Christian than that in its race relations. We of the North must confess that on the whole we do not have a brotherly love for the Negro. Oh, yes, we do tend to be benevolent toward him, though I

am sure not so much so as do the whites of the South. But the Negro doesn't want the white man's benevolence of either the Northern or Southern brand. It carries with it too much damage to his sense of self-respect, which many white people seem to believe is non-existent in Negroes. India doesn't want England's benevolence any longer. She has had enough of it. Labor doesn't want management's benevolence. The day for that kind of benevolence is done for the Negro and all the rest of them. So that at present the dominant groups and nations and races of the earth are experiencing a painful awakening to the consequences of the evil of substituting benevolence and charity for rights and opportunity and justice. Yes, "justice" is also a good word too, and sooner or later someone should introduce it into a discussion of the Christian aspects of race relations.

Charity and benevolence are among the noblest of Christian virtues. But if, as in this instance, the benevolent attitude of the more fortunate and privileged toward those of lesser estate shall serve to confirm and perpetuate these levels of difference, then it becomes a curse not only to those who receive but as well to those who give. I keep saying to my fellow Northern whites, "When shall we replace the benevolent mind with the mind of respect and opportunity and justice in our race relationships, and cease treating the Negroes as an inferior race and a servant class?" Brotherly love means just that and nothing less. Sometimes the most superficial bit of gesture, or the absence of it, betrays the great social gap existing between our two races. I am daily preparing myself to withstand the awful shock that may one day come to me when, in some American community where it is still the custom for white men to doff the hat to white women, I shall suddenly come upon the scene of a white man showing the same mark of respect toward a colored woman.

Furthermore, speaking of womanhood in connection with the problem of fraternization between the races suggests that we cannot be so sure that "white people naturally want to be with white people, and the black people want to associate with their own race."

Indeed, the large number of those in our society of mixed blood would seem to indicate that there are times when white people and colored people do choose to be together. The record would tell us, I believe, that in the majority of cases it was the white person who took the initiative to be with the colored one.

Can it really be a fact that "there is no muffing of the Word of God in the South" in the matter of preaching on this issue? I know not how it is in the South, but we certainly muff it here in the North. Those of us who preach are pretty much scared of the race prejudice that sits in our pews. Nor are we preachers ourselves altogether right at heart on this burning question. Here we still follow Jesus afar off and blame the distance between us upon the great difficulties of a very practical world. Let me humbly confess that we in the North find it infinitely easier to throw up a defense for our own shortcomings and to preach against the sins of those far from us, such as the Hitler treatment of the Jews, the purges in Russia, or the discrimination against the Negroes by Southern whites.

Pastor Brokhoff is correct. We of the North can use our imagination, and once in a while observe a thing or two as we journey southward to enjoy the famed hospitality of our Southern friends. Yet it is practically impossible for us to have an adequate appreciation of the terrific problems which whites and Negroes confront in their attempt to harmonize their common life in areas where the two groups are so equally divided. The gospel does leaven, and the Christian church will increasingly make its contribution toward the solution of these problems. We pray that the church of the South and our church of the North together may exercise greater boldness in defense of the gospel and in its application to our respective urgent problems.

Some years ago, after reporting on a trip made through the South for the purpose of observing existing social and economic conditions, I was charged by someone who had lived there with failing to appreciate the great complexity of the situation. My reply was that I was not so critical of Southerners for not already

having solved their problems, some of which seem fairly insuperable, as I was dismayed to find the preached gospel permitting so many good Christians to continue to live so complacently and comfortably side by side with such tremendous problems. For I'm afraid I must frankly disagree with the statement from Georgia that "the South has been able to handle the racial problem successfully," and that, "For many years both races have been living side by side in harmony and comparative contentment."

One could and does frequently make equally serious thrusts at the Christian community in the North with respect to its particular sore spots. And well do I know that were our geographical positions to be reversed we would do no better or no worse in the face of the special racial situation in the South than do those who now confront it. But this challenge to the white and black peoples of America to make a go of life together is becoming increasingly urgent. I have vivid recollections of the reactions recently expressed on this point by some of the finest of our country's Negro Christian leaders, ministers, editors, and others. These men were part of that great conference of the Christian forces of America which met in Cleveland for consideration of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals in preparation for the launching of the United Nations Organization at San Francisco. There the great pressing problems of the whole world were under consideration day by day. Time and again one of those Negro leaders would get to his feet and passionately insist that something must be done soon about the white-Negro situation in America, else rapidly growing racial irritations and unrest, will result in internal strife and confusion to the embarrassment and weakening of a nation that is expected to play a major role in the interest of world harmony and peace.

It may be that the Negro is "slower than a tortoise," and "often is found sleeping on the job," so that he gets his poor reward in his low income. But I know a situation in which the Negro also figures, wherein the white man, who is really in position to set the pace for everything that actually happens in America, has been slower than a tortoise. In fact he has often been found sleeping on

the job. And he has had correspondingly poor reward, too, in the resulting low level of interracial relationships which are causing an increasing anxiety to our fair land.

I have been moved to respond as I have in these lines to the article by Pastor Brokhoff, not because he refutes the idea that the South is less Christian than the North in race relations, but because he would let all Christian America off too easily. We in the North are pretty bad; much less Christian in race relations than his generous apology would make the South appear to be. To my mind, the real issue confronting all of us Christians, regardless of state or section, is this: Is white America Christian enough in its race relations? Are white Christians anywhere Christian enough? Perhaps the Georgia player on this all-American team will carry the ball from this point.

NEGRO LUTHERAN WORK IN NEW YORK¹

HARRY J. KREIDER
Ozone Park, New York City

THE amazingly successful Negro Lutheran work in New York City is already in its thirty-fourth year. But conspicuous as its development has been, it is nevertheless exceedingly young when compared with the age of organized Lutheranism in New York. The Lutheran Church there was established nearly three hundred years ago, yet in all the years down to 1913 it has had little to do with Negro work, and much of that was disappointing.

I

Throughout the colonial period, when the Lutherans in New York had no synod on their territory, there appear to be only a few scattered references to Negroes in the Church. The earliest is in 1669, when Pastor Fabritius received into the membership of the New York City congregation a Negro "fifty years old, who was baptized and named Emmanuel." Early in the succeeding century, that congregation had a Negro as one of its prominent members, Are Van Guinea by name. In his home near Pluckemin, New Jersey, the first Lutheran services in the Raritan Valley were held in 1714, and from those services an organized congregation later emerged. But so far as is known, no other Negroes were in the new congregation.

1 This article is based upon the minutes of the Synods in New York mentioned herein, as well as of the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Lutheran Church. Items connected with the colonial period have sources cited in the author's *Lutheranism in Colonial New York*, N. Y. 1942, chapter 4, section 2. The story of the Negro Lutheran congregation in the Bronx, New York City, in Section VI, is based upon the facts secured by the writer in a personal interview with the Rev. Axel C. Kildegaard, Sr., pastor of Trinity Danish Lutheran Church in the Bronx and founder of the Negro congregation. For the relationship of the various synods in New York, see chart in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Vol. XIX (July 1946), page 296.

II

The first synod in New York, the New York Ministerium, was in existence almost fifty years before it had anything to do with Negroes. In 1832, Doctor John Bachman, then President of the South Carolina Synod but previously a prominent member of the New York Ministerium, recommended that a Jehu Jones, Junior, be ordained by the Ministerium, "with a view to his laboring as a missionary in the colony of Liberia, Africa."

The communication was intended for the meeting of the Ministerium in October of that year, but it did not arrive until after the meeting had been adjourned. Several of the pastors, however, were still in New York City, and they took it upon themselves to "assemble together as a self-constituted body" in order to arrive at a "decisive and instant action."

Jones was accordingly ordained, and the matter was reported the following year to the Ministerium, which decided that in the emergency "the brethren had done well, and their act was thus approved." But a curious addition was made, that inasmuch as "the Reverend Mr. Jones did not, although present, apply for admission into our clerical body, no formal resolution on the subject was deemed necessary." Jones never did become a member of the Ministerium, nor did he ever affiliate with any other Lutheran Synod. Furthermore, it appeared that he had no intention of going to Africa, for shortly after his ordination he went to Philadelphia and attempted to organize a Negro congregation there.

He made a dismal failure of the Philadelphia project because of his "inefficiency and general deportment," and in the estimation of the Ministerium he was deemed to have "forfeited whatever confidence the church had reposed in his Christian character and integrity."

Jones himself, however, was not at all abashed by the failure, but merely bounced back to the New York Ministerium with more than a full measure of boldness. That was in 1849, seventeen years after his ordination. He presented a letter to the Ministerium, signed "Jehu Jones, Lutheran Missionary," in which he stated that

he planned to "establish a Lutheran congregation among the colored population in the city of New York," and calmly requested the Ministerium for aid.

The matter was referred to a special committee, of which Henry N. Pohlman was chairman. The committee brought back a scathing report about Jones's misdeeds, and ended with a sharp denunciation:

From the period of his ordination to the present time, he has never been in connection with this or any other Lutheran Ministerium; and as he represents himself to be a Lutheran missionary, and under this designation has imposed himself upon the churches, making collections of money and appropriating them to his own personal use, we deem it our duty to warn the Christian public against his misrepresentations and impositions.

That conclusively ended any thought, certainly at the time, of doing any work among the Negroes in New York City. And nothing more was heard of Jones.

III

Just four years after Jones had been ordained by the New York Ministerium and had started on his checkered career, the Franckean Synod had its first experience with a Negro, through an application from Daniel A. Payne, a Negro student at Gettysburg Seminary, to be licensed, as a preliminary step to his ordination. The application was favorably considered, and Payne was licensed by President John Lawyer in May 1837. Immediately after this he located in the city of Troy, and "preached to the colored people in that place."

Perhaps the Franckean Synod had heard of the experience of the New York Ministerium with Jehu Jones. At any rate it did not ordain Payne until two years after he was licensed. But even this precaution did not prevent the disappointment that followed. Payne gave up the Troy work soon after his ordination and went to Philadelphia, but whether he did any work there is not disclosed.

Several years later, in 1842, Payne wrote to the Synod stating that he could not pay some obligation which he owed the Synod, and requesting a dismissal to the "Colored Methodist Church." The Synod, however, refused to approve, and decided that "he should continue his relation until he has discharged our claims and then he should be honorably dismissed." Nothing further was heard of him except that his address was changed to Washington, D. C., but it was reported that even without a formal dismissal he had nevertheless connected himself with the African Methodist Episcopal Church. A letter was directed to be sent to him inquiring about this, but nothing apparently came of it, and after 1843 his name no longer appeared on the clerical roll of the Synod.

It was not until fifty years later, in 1894, that Payne was again heard of, when his death was mentioned at the meeting of the Synod. He had made good in the African Methodist Church; in fact, said the report, "his qualifications [had] induced this body to elect him as their bishop, and . . . he was highly esteemed for his great usefulness until his recent decease."

IV

The Franckean Synod's disappointment over Payne, however, was more than offset by a noteworthy experience in 1885, when the first native of the Muhlenberg Lutheran Mission in Liberia, Africa, was ordained. The matter came to the Franckean Synod because the distinguished missionary to that colony, David A. Day, was a member of the Synod.

The candidate was David Davidson, a man of about thirty-five years of age. He had been educated in the Liberian Mission School, and had then married and settled near the mission on a small coffee farm from which he derived the support of himself and his family.

Missionary Day had met Davidson upon his arrival as the American missionary to Liberia in 1874, and had found him "a very useful, promising Christian." Sometime later the two "talked

over the subject of the ministry, and he (Davidson) decided that he could best serve the Lord in that capacity."

Day was so impressed by Davidson's progress in preparing for the ministry that he eventually recommended him to the Board of Foreign Missions of the General Synod as eminently worthy of licensure. The Board thereupon turned to the Franckean Synod, and requested President Nicholas Van Alstine to license the candidate for one year.

Van Alstine was naturally reluctant to issue the license. It was no light responsibility to grant to a native of a foreign country permission to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments, when the candidate could not appear for a personal examination and when his character and ability could be vouched for by only one American pastor, namely, the missionary in charge. Then, too, if the matter be considered in the light of the past, there were the unfortunate experiences with Daniel Payne and Jehu Jones. Van Alstine therefore consulted some of his colleagues privately—the next synod meeting would not be held until eight months later—but they assured him that the recommendation of their esteemed colleague David Day together with the request of the Board of Foreign Missions were sufficient grounds to warrant him to exercise his synodical authority.

The license was therefore issued to candidate Davidson on November 8, 1882, and dispatched to Liberia. Three months later, on Sunday, February 4, 1883, a solemn service was held at the Muhlenberg Mission, at which Missionary Day formally proclaimed the license of the Franckean Synod, and David Davidson "was duly set apart to the Gospel ministry in the presence of a large and deeply interested congregation."

In the ensuing year Day rejoiced to see that Davidson fully justified the confidence placed in him by his American brethren. At the expiration of the license, Day commended his native associate to the Board of Foreign Missions as one who "was worthy of admission into the Gospel ministry," and the Board in turn requested the Franckean Synod to take care of the ordination.

This time there was no hesitancy. Missionary Day was promptly appointed a committee to examine Davidson, and, by virtue of the authority conferred upon him by the Synod, to ordain him. The ordination service was held on Sunday, March 23, 1884, and was one that must have lingered long in the memories of those fortunate enough to participate. Missionary Day wrote a glowing account of it:

Last Sunday afternoon, March 23, 1884, we ordained David Davidson, our first native preacher. The chapel was crowded, so that the Mission children, who themselves almost filled it, had to leave the house. There were present a number of Liberian colored ministers, and the service was watched with intense interest throughout.

The fact that the candidate was a native, trained on the ground, a man known far and wide for his uprightness and integrity of life, brought a large number of people from the Liberian settlements. Rev. S. J. Campbell, of the African M. E. Church, preached the sermon, and your Missionary, assisted by a number of others, conducted the ordination.

Two years later, in April 1885, Missionary Day became seriously ill, whereupon, "in order to release him from some of his burdens," Davidson was installed as pastor of the Muhlenberg Mission. At the same time the congregation declared itself self-supporting.

Seven years later, in 1882, there came an honor to Davidson that has fallen to few pastors. Another native, Joseph Stewart, had been educated by the Women's Missionary Society of the Franckean Synod, and was now ready for ordination. The Board of Foreign Missions, upon the recommendation of Missionary Day, once again requested the Franckean Synod to care for the ordination, and President John Dominic of the Synod authorized David Day and David Davidson to ordain the young candidate. This was done at an impressive service on June 5, 1892. The details of the service, unfortunately, were not reported in the minutes of the Synod or of the General Synod.

Davidson continued his ministry in Muhlenberg Mission for only another year, when he was disabled by disease. He died the

following year, on August 5, 1894, having been in the Gospel ministry more than eleven years. The tribute by Missionary Day was a beautiful one:

"In his death, the mission has lost as faithful a worker as ever lived, the community a splendid citizen, the family a devoted husband and father, and our missionaries a wise counsellor and warm-hearted friend."

Joseph Stewart continued his work in a congregation not far from the Muhlenberg Mission, but survived Davidson by only three years. He died in May 1897, at the age of thirty-two, honored and respected to the end. Missionary Day, incidentally, survived both his native associates, but not by much, for he died in December 1897.

V

The first application of a Negro congregation for admission to a synod in New York came in 1880, but it was an unfortunate episode from beginning to end.

This time it was the New York and New Jersey Synod. At its meeting in 1880 two congregations applied for membership: the Church of the Reformation at Hartford, Connecticut, and Trinity (Negro) Church at Greenport, Long Island. Both had fulfilled all the requirements of the Synod for admission.

The two applications were peculiarly interrelated. The year previously, 1879, candidate Louis H. Schneider became pastor of St. Peter's Church at Greenport upon his ordination. At the same time he ministered to a little Negro congregation there—the congregation which was applying for admission to the Synod. In the spring of 1880, Schneider left Greenport because of the "unfavorable influence of the climate," and went to Hartford. There he organized the German Lutheran Church of the Reformation—the second congregation which was applying for admission.

The Committee on Applications of Churches reported first on the Hartford church, and recommended that it be "cordially received into connection with this Synod." But when the committee

reported next on the Negro Church, there was no recommendation to receive it "cordially." Rather, the committee seemed to go out of its way to make statements that smacked of plain race prejudice:

In regard to the second, we would respectfully submit, that whilst we believe that all men are created free and equal, and that our brethren of African descent are entitled to our prayers and our assistance in their efforts to extend the Redeemer's kingdom, yet we cannot see our way clear under existing circumstances to admit the said congregation as an integral part of Synod, because of the ecclesiastical difficulties that would in all probability follow. . . .

We would, therefore, kindly suggest to our colored brethren that they make efforts with some other Christian denomination, whose circumstances and arrangements would be more likely to supply them with the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments.

Of the four members of the committee (three pastors and a layman), the most prominent were John L. Kistler, professor at Hartwick Seminary, and Jeremiah Zimmerman, pastor of First Church, Syracuse. It was particularly unkind of Pastor Zimmerman to join in such a report, for his one year old congregation was favorably considered by the Synod to pay the interest on a \$5,000 indebtedness on its church property. The little Negro congregation, on the contrary, had asked for no financial help.

It was the more unfortunate because the young Negro congregation was only a tiny one, embracing but eight communing members, together with four teachers and twelve pupils in its Sunday School.² It had, of course, no pastor, now that Louis Schneider had gone to Hartford.

The feeling of the Synod toward the Negro congregation, however, was a refreshing contrast to that of its committee. A substitute recommendation was promptly offered and adopted, and the congregation was admitted. The congregation's representative, the Negro George Addison, was then received as a lay delegate.

The connection of the congregation with the Synod was short-lived. The year after it was admitted it reported that it had called

2 The fact that the congregation had so few communing members was not so uncommon at that time, for several Synods in New York had congregations of from five to thirty members,

a Baptist preacher who would "present himself for examination and admission to this Synod." But nothing further was heard from him. The congregation reported further that its Sunday School had increased to eighteen members; that it possessed a building that could accommodate more than a hundred people; that Pastor Schneider had preached occasionally for them; and that two donations had been received, one of some seventy-five library books from the Spruce Run congregation, Pastor C. H. Traver, and another of \$51 toward an organ from St. John's Church, Christopher Street, New York City, Pastor A. C. Wedekind.

A year later, 1882, the report came in that a Methodist deacon had been called as pastor, with the request of the congregation for his ordination and installation by the Synod. The President of the Synod had written the candidate concerning the "proper course to pursue according to the requirements of our constitution," but nothing was heard from him. The congregation had asked also for \$60 aid, a request which the Home Mission Committee of Synod approved and passed on to the General Synod Home Mission Board.

Still another year, and this time a report was received that an ordained minister of the African Methodist Church had been called, and that he had taken charge of the congregation. The minister had written the President of the Synod, stating "that he had been a traveling itinerant preacher of the African Methodist Church, [and that] wishing to unite with our Synod he wrote to the Bishop of that Church but failed to get his papers, as he was absent." The minister was not overlooking the recommendation of the previous year, and continued in his letter that he "was anxious to know about the \$60 which the Home Mission Committee had recommended to the General Synod as an appropriation to them." But he did not appear at the meeting of the Synod. Nor was anything more heard from him or from the congregation, and in 1885 it was noted that "the Greenport colored church not having reported for three years, was, on motion, dropped from the roll," whereupon the whole matter was closed.

VI

The Lutheran Church in New York was already more than 260 years old before the first permanent Negro Lutheran congregation was established there. Many Negro Lutherans had been migrating to Harlem, New York City, from the Danish West Indies. A few of them attended Lutheran churches in Manhattan, but nothing was done for them to have a church of their own.

Then, in the summer of 1913, an influential West Indian Negro, secretary of the Pullman Porters' Union, called upon the Reverend Axel C. Kildegaard, pastor of Trinity Danish Lutheran Church in the Bronx, New York City, to have his infant son baptized. He was deeply impressed with the cordial reception given him, and with the beautiful little Danish Church in which his son's baptism took place. Soon afterward he returned, to discuss with Pastor Kildegaard the hope that he and other Danish West Indians might come to the Danish Church there for some services of their own on Sunday evenings.

The pastor graciously fulfilled their hope, and a schedule was arranged of two Sunday evening services every month. The services were begun in September of 1913, and were maintained continuously by Pastor Kildegaard twice a month throughout the ensuing six and a half years until the congregation removed to Harlem. Attendances ranged from thirty to forty; with a larger number, of course, at festival occasions. At the same time, Pastor Kildegaard ministered to the people in their personal spiritual needs, in baptisms, confirmations, weddings and burials.

Not long after services were started, there was talk of organizing as a congregation, and early in 1913 this was accomplished, the group taking the name of the Danish West Indian Lutheran Congregation. No formal constitution was adopted; it was felt sufficient to have simply a few regulations, which were written out and adopted.³ Nor was any synodical connection sought.

3 It is not known, unfortunately, whether this record, together with the minutes and financial books of the Church Council, are still in existence. All the records were in the custody of the lay officers of the church council.

The congregation held regular annual meetings, at which time elections were held for members of the church council. The church council embraced five members, four men and a woman. The council met whenever necessary, usually three or four times a year.

The congregation was in its fourth year, when, in 1917, the United States acquired the Danish West Indies from Denmark, and renamed them the Virgin Islands. The care of the large Lutheran work there was taken over by a group of American Lutherans who the following year joined with others to form the United Lutheran Church. One of the first steps taken was to send Pastor Kildegaard to the Islands, to learn at first hand the conditions there.

The United Lutheran Church's West Indies Board, to whom direct responsibility was entrusted, soon discovered that there were in New York City hundreds of West Indian Negro Lutherans who were not connected with the Negro congregation worshipping in the Bronx. The Board proceeded promptly to do something about the situation. Judged by the standards of the past, when in so many instances it took so long for a movement to get under way, it is nothing short of amazing that within three years of the acquisition of the Virgin Islands by the United States, services were held every Sunday for the Negro Lutherans in Harlem.

The credit for this quite out of the ordinary procedure is due the indefatigable present Executive Secretary of the Board of American Missions of the United Lutheran Church, Doctor Zenan M. Corbé. At the time he undertook the Harlem work he was pastor of the Church of the Transfiguration in Philadelphia, and the Executive Secretary of the then West Indies Board. He visited the congregation in the Bronx, and the proposal was made to transfer the work to Harlem itself, in order that many more West Indian Negroes might be reached. Dr. Corbé gave assurance that he himself would be responsible for the work in Harlem, under the West Indies Board.

Upon this assurance, the entire Negro congregation left Trinity Danish Church in the spring of 1920, taking with them the

blessing of its founder and pastor. The members, for their part, amply demonstrated their affection for Pastor Kildegaard for his gracious ministry among them.

Dr. Corbé took upon himself no small task in assuming responsibility for the work in Harlem. He continued his principal work as pastor of the church in Philadelphia, and upon concluding his Sunday morning work there he traveled over to Harlem for the evening, conducting Sunday School at seven o'clock and church service at eight.

Among the young men who assisted him in Harlem were four from his congregation in Philadelphia, all students at Wagner College, Staten Island. But his most valued assistant was a young Negro, a native of the Virgin Islands, who was later to become the pastor of the church. He was Paul Edward West, who came from the Virgin Islands to New York City in April 1920 to prepare for the ministry. During the eight years of his studies at Wagner College and the Philadelphia Seminary he spent much time in the Harlem congregation.

Rooms in the Young Women's Christian Association in Harlem were secured for the work, but the quarters soon became cramped. Within a year the attendance at church services had passed 100. The work grew by leaps and bounds, and within another year the congregation numbered 304 communicant members, and in its vigorous youthfulness was already boasting that it was the "largest colored Lutheran congregation in the western hemisphere." In February 1922 a Negro deaconess, Sister Emma Francis, of the Virgin Islands, was added to the staff.

With such a growth, it was imperative that a permanent church home be secured. It was learned that only one suitable property was available, quoted at the staggering cost of \$50,000. Regardless of price, however, property simply had to be secured. Consequently a year later, on January 1, 1923, the present building at 74 West 126th Street, Harlem, was secured by the West Indies Board, but the cost by that time was \$57,000. A beautiful church auditorium is on the first floor, Sunday School rooms and kitchen

on the second floor, and janitor's quarters, offices, and rooms for workers on the third.

Upon occupying the building, the congregation became formally organized, and honored its spiritual leader, Dr. Corbé, by taking for itself the name of his Philadelphia congregation, the "Church of the Transfiguration."⁴ Its members showed their appreciation by contributing the sum of \$4,500 toward the expenses the first year they were in the building. The phenomenal growth continued, and a year after occupancy the communicant membership numbered 430. Two years later, in 1926, a second Negro deaconess, Sister Edith Prince, was added to the staff.

A notable event took place in 1928, just eight years after the congregation was brought to Harlem. Paul West, having completed his work at the Philadelphia Seminary, was ordained on June 6th by the New York and New England Synod, and became the first full-time pastor of the flourishing congregation. He was installed on November 4th by President Samuel Trexler of the Synod, with Dr. Corbé assisting. At the time of Pastor West's ordination, the congregation was received into the membership of the New York and New England Synod, its first synodical connection.

The Church of the Transfiguration did not remain alone long. When it was learned that some of its members had located in Jamaica, Long Island (within the City of New York), the Negro Church of the Holy Trinity was organized there in 1934. But many more Transfiguration members kept moving northward in Harlem, and in 1942 a third Negro Church, St. Paul's, was organized some five miles from the mother church. Interestingly enough, the pastor of the third church was a lay member of the Jamaica congregation prior to his ordination. All three congregations and pastors are members now of the United Lutheran Synod of New York.

4 The congregation uses the year of its formal organization, 1923, as the year of its beginning, which is the reason for its "twentieth" anniversary celebration in 1943. Its continuous existence, however, has been uninterrupted since 1913, and the congregation was actually thirty years old in 1943.

ECCLESIASTICAL ORDERS IN AMERICAN COLONIAL LUTHERANISM¹

ROBERT FORTENBAUGH

Gettysburg, Pennsylvania

THE Fourth Series of lectures on the Augsburg Confession on the Holman Foundation continues in progress. In later years presentation of the articles in numerical order, the earlier practice, has given way to free selection by each lecturer of an article not yet treated in the current series, in which he has a special interest, and presumably some competence. Among the articles not yet considered in this fourth series is the Fourteenth. This has been selected as the one to be presented today.

Translated into English by Henry Eyster Jacobs,² this article is entitled, "Of Ecclesiastical Orders." The text is, "Of Ecclesiastical Order, they teach, that no one should publicly teach in the Church or administer the Sacraments, unless he be regularly called." Comparison with other English translations, and with both the Latin and the German versions of the earliest editions of the Confession confirms the essential correctness of Jacobs' translation. This form will accordingly be used as the basis for this discussion without further comment, except to note that the German version of the *Editio Princeps* has "*oeffentlich lehren oder predigen*," that is, "publicly teach or preach." This addition of "or preach" is not, however, in the early Latin forms nor in any authoritative English translation.

The lecture on the Fourteenth Article in the First Series was given by Luther A. Gotwald in 1879 under the title of "The Call to the Ministry." As was fitting and proper in the first presentation of the article on the Foundation, Dr. Gotwald exhaustively treated the subject historically, dogmatically, and practically, filling ninety-four pages in the printed lectures of the First Series. The lecture in the Second Series was given in 1901 by Jacob A. Clutz, also under the title of "The Call to the Ministry." Dr. Clutz stated that his first intention was to discuss the whole subject of the ministerial office from the historical and dogmatical points of view, and to that end had begun his study. However, he says, he became convinced that it "seemed to be a work of

1 Lecture on the Holman Foundation delivered at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, May 9, 1947, on Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession.

2 Jacobs, Henry Eyster, *The Book of Concord* (People's Edition, Philadelphia, 1916), p. 41.

supererogation to repeat the task,"³ and accordingly presented the sum of the teachings of the dogmaticians briefly in eight "thetical propositions" which he submitted "with great diffidence."⁴ Having thus given some forty per cent of his time to such general considerations he turned to devote himself for the remainder of his lecture to "a comparative study of the views held by the several bodies of Lutherans in this country, . . ." He did this "under the belief that this will prove more interesting and profitable . . . than any further discussion of the views held by our Lutheran Fathers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries."⁵ His lecture filled fifty-three pages of *The Lutheran Quarterly*. The lecture in the Third Series was given in 1924 by George Albert Getty, again under the title of "The Call to the Ministry." Dr. Getty chose to emphasize two aspects of the call to the ministry, which, he said, "may be conveniently designated as the *internal* and the *external*."⁶ He did not find in Article XIV any direct reference to the *internal* call. "This appears to be taken for granted, and the necessity for the proper certification of the inner call by the *external call* which comes through the Church, appears to be the special point upon which emphasis is laid."⁷ His conclusion, ending his eighteen pages of discussion in *The Lutheran Quarterly*, dealt with the several requirements to be complied with before one could be admitted into the ministry by the West Pennsylvania Synod of that day. "In following out this course of procedure it would appear that every safeguard necessary for the proper protection of the Church and for the securing of a properly qualified ministry, has been provided, and further that in pursuing such a policy we are fulfilling all that is required of us in Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession, . . ."⁸

Mindful of the meaning of the article under consideration, and not forgetting the earlier contributions of lecturers on this Foundation whose several contributions constitute a general commentary on the article, it has been thought that an original contribution can be made in this lecture by dealing particularly with the question of how the article was applied among Lutherans in America in colonial times, under the title, "Ecclesiastical Orders in American Colonial Lutheranism."

Before entering upon a detailed presentation of a study of that question it will be useful as a preliminary to describe briefly what the article is understood to mean. It is evident that its primary object is to establish a principle concerning the administration of the Means of Grace in such a manner as

3 Clutz, Jacob A., "The Call to the Ministry," *Lutheran Quarterly*, Oct. 1901, 471.

4 *Ibid.*, 474.

5 *Ibid.*

6 Getty, George Albert, "Article XIV of the Augsburg Confession. The Call to the Ministry," *Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1924, 287.

7 *Ibid.*, 288.

8 *Ibid.*, 299.

to secure good order in the Church. The office of teaching the Word and administering the Sacraments belongs to the Church as the congregation of believers in its corporate capacity. This is the teaching of Articles V and VII of the Confession. Article V, "Of the Ministry of the Church," sets forth that in order to make it possible for men to obtain faith which justifies before God (see Article IV) ". . . , the Office of Teaching the Gospel and administering the Sacraments was instituted." Article VII, "Of the Church," sets forth that One Holy Church is to continue forever as the agency through which the ministry functions. This Church is described as "the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the Sacraments rightly administered."

Because, as Article VII further teaches, it is not necessary "that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies, instituted by men, should be everywhere alike," it follows that the Church has the full liberty of determining how the administration of the Means of Grace shall be arranged for, so that good order in the Church is secured. The position of the teaching of Article XIV is to be understood as standing midway between two extreme views: (1) the Anabaptist or fanatical extreme which denies the value and necessity of the ministerial office, for which view the Anabaptists specifically are condemned in the second paragraph of Article V, and (2) the Roman extreme which considers the ministry a priesthood which it exalts into a separate and superior order. The mediate position, set forth in the article, is the generally accepted doctrine of all Protestant churches who recognize the ministry as an office, divinely established, and who either assert or imply that no one should discharge the special and sacred functions of this divinely established office unless he first be regularly called into the office.

The vital, the distinctive, part of Article XIV is in the qualification, "unless he be regularly called, *ohne ordentlich Beruf, nisi rite vocatus.*" All controversies or disagreements which have arisen over the interpretation of this article in the Lutheran Church, at least, have revolved about this qualification. It will therefore be the present purpose to learn how it was interpreted and applied in the formative years of the Lutheran Church in America. It must be well noted that in this study the *external* aspect of the call, or the *formal* authorization of ministerial status by an ecclesiastical authority, is the special meaning of Article XIV.

Lutheranism had its ecclesiastical beginnings in America in the seventeenth century when the Church in Europe, following its adherents as they migrated to the New World, began to be implanted here. One common basis of agreement in doctrine is to be observed throughout this whole process of implantation. This was adherence to the chief symbol of Lutheranism, the Augsburg Confession. This conclusion is supported by the following facts, selected from many. In 1643 Governor John Printz arrived in New Sweden

to begin the "Golden Age" of Swedish life on the Delaware. Among his instructions was this significant one:⁹

Above all things, shall the Governor consider and see to it that a true and due worship, becoming honor, laud, and praise be paid to the Most High God in all things, and, to that end, all proper care shall be taken that divine service be zealously performed according to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Council of Upsala, and the ceremonies of the Swedish Church; . . .

In October, 1656 Lutherans in New Amsterdam, in an appeal to Governor Stuyvesant and his Council at New Amsterdam, described themselves thus:¹⁰ "We, the united adherers of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, residing here in New Netherland. . . ."

When Pastors Rudman, Bjoerk and Auren sailed for America in 1696 to serve the Swedish Churches on the Delaware they carried a commission which obligated them¹¹

. . . to teach, without any human additions or side doctrine, God's holy and saving Word purely and clearly, as it is fully presented in the Canonical Books of the prophets in the Old and of the apostles in the New Testament, and briefly explained in the oecumenical symbols of the Christian Church, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, as well as especially in the Augsburg Confession and the other symbolical books received by the Evangelical Church.

In 1703 when Rudman, Bjoerk and Sandel ordained Justus Falckner it was to qualify him to "minister to the congregation which holds the faith of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, in the city and province of New York."¹² The ordination certificate of Henry Melchior Muehlenberg contained the following confessional testimony:¹³

In agreement with apostolic doctrine, . . . we commended to him the ministry of teaching the gospel and administering the sacraments, according to the call and rule given in the writings of the prophets and apostles, the sum of which is contained in the three symbols—the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian—in the Augsburg Confession, A.D. 1530, laid before Emperor Charles V, in the Apology of the same, in Dr. Luther's Large and Small Catechisms, in the articles submitted in the Smalcald Convention and in the Formula of Concord, written A.D. 1576 on controverted points of doctrine. For he solemnly promised that he would propose to his hearers what would be conformed and consentient to these writings, and that he would never depart from the sense they give.

9 Jacobs, Henry Eyster, *A History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States* (New York, 1893), p. 82, quoting Israel Acrelius, *History of New Sweden* (W. M. Reynolds, translator, Philadelphia, 1874), pp. 35-9. Another translation of this Article XXVI of the *Instructions* is in *Papers Relating to the Colonies on the Delaware*, 2nd Series, Vol. 5 of the *Pennsylvania Archives*, 773.

10 *Ecclesiastical Records: State of New York* (7 vols., Albany, 1901-16), I, 358-9.

11 Jacobs, *History*, 91.

12 Clark, Delber Wallace, *The World of Justus Falckner* (Philadelphia, 1946), p. 33.

13 Jacobs, *History*, 212.

Joshua Kocherthal, who entitled his record book, "Church Book of the Church of the Germans Who Embrace the Augsburg Confession,"¹⁴ Berkenmyer and Hartwig in New York, the pioneer pastors of Georgia and the Carolinas, and later recruits from Europe for the growing ministry of the Church in all these areas—all were obligated in their European ordinations at least to the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession.

In the church on the Monacacy in June, 1747 Muehlenberg, as an early example of his intention to lead the churches under his direction in right confessional paths, wrote "several propositions and articles" in the church book. He says¹⁵ that he set down these in English

among others, of the following import: That our German Lutherans acknowledge the Holy Word of God in the writings of the prophets and apostles, and also, the unaltered Augsburg Confession and the rest of the symbolical books; and when possible, have the Sacraments administered to them, according to these by regularly called and ordained preachers. . . . This I publicly read to the congregation, and explained it to them in German, with this addition: whoever would be and remain such a Lutheran should subscribe his name. Those Lutherans who were present subscribed readily.

In the constitution for St. Michael's Church, Philadelphia, the first fully developed congregational constitution for a Lutheran congregation in America, the obligation of the pastors is stated thus:¹⁶

The present living pastors, and their successors, regularly called, shall preach the Word of God, as given by the Apostles and Prophets, and in accordance with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, publicly, purely, briefly, clearly, thoroughly, and to edification.

M. Reu's conclusion¹⁷ on this point can not be improved upon and is included here as a final opinion:

The pastors who came to the United States in the seventeenth century, no matter whether they came from Holland, Sweden or Germany, and whether they were pietists

14 *Ibid.*, 116-7.

15 Oswald, Jonathan (translator), *Reports of the United German Evangelical Lutheran Congregations in North America, Especially in Pennsylvania* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1880 and 1881), II, 87.

16 Schmucker, B. M., "The Organization of the Congregation in the Early Lutheran Churches in America," *Lutheran Church Review*, July, 1887. The constitution is printed in full in *Nachrichten von der vereinigten Deutschen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Gemeinden in Nord-Amerika, absonderlich in Pennsylvanien*, W. J. Mann and B. M. Schmucker, editors (New Edition, 2 vols., Allentown, 1886 and 1895), II, 435-41. An older edition, partly translated by Oswald (see above), was printed in Halle in 1787. The New Edition has valuable notes and other materials in addition to the *Reports*. This source will be referred to hereafter as *Halle Reports*, the new edition always being meant.

17 Reu, M., *The Augsburg Confession. A Collection of Sources with an Historical Introduction* (Chicago, 1930), p. 202.

or orthodox, were all pledged to the Augsburg Confession and taught in accordance with it. They also saw to it that the candidates, which they ordained, were pledged to this Confession. The first constitutions of these congregations, which were patterns for many of the later ones, contained a paragraph which acknowledged the Confession. Although the constitutions of the first synods, the Ministerium of Pennsylvania and the Ministerium of New York, did not expressly name this Confession they nevertheless did not admit candidates to ordination who were not confessors of the Augsburg Confession.

Now, specifically, in what manner did the Lutherans of colonial America, assuming that they considered themselves exponents of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and sincerely attached to its teachings, apply the principle of Ecclesiastical Order set forth in Article XIV, particularly with respect to the important qualification "unless he be regularly called"?

One of the most difficult of all the problems involved in the implantation of the Church in the New World was that of pastoral, or ministerial, supply. It was never satisfactorily solved until with the practical completion of the implantation a native ministry was provided. Until such a native ministry which fully met the need was provided, several sources of ministerial supply were necessarily exploited. It is now in order to describe in some detail these sources, and to estimate the quality of the ministerial supply which became available to serve the Church in colonial days. This limitation in time is set for convenience' sake, as well as for some formal reasons, and it should be clearly understood that it is not contended here that the close of the colonial period found the Church fully implanted with the problem of ministerial supply finally solved. However, with the political independence of the colonies established and nearly one hundred and fifty years of experience accumulated; with the Church in the process of becoming Americanized, and with ways and means for the more regular preparation and calling of native sons to the ministry improvised, a logical terminal point for this study is here found. Whence came the pastors for the Lutheran Church in colonial America is now the question to which the remainder of this inquiry is devoted.

Two general categories of Lutheran congregations or parishes are to be recognized in the colonial period. First, those which were independent of the authority of any ecclesiastical body, and independent of each other. In these the problems, both of an available supply and of the worth of those available, were serious. Some of them were fortunate in their selection of pastors; others were most unfortunate. Yet, from all information at hand, it is safe to assert that all sought to call and support pastors whom they, according to their lights, considered to be "regularly called." They sought men who could produce certificates of regular ordination, and were sometimes meanly imposed upon; they tried to secure regular ordination for some worthy men whom they had selected and in whom they trusted, and were sometimes in

error in their choice. In any case, it seems that for those whom they had selected publicly to teach in the Church and to administer the Sacraments (especially for this latter responsibility) they were diligent to choose only such as, to their satisfaction, were "regularly called."

Specific illustrations of the generalizations just made will now be offered to demonstrate their validity. First to be noticed is the practice of seeking properly qualified men from organized European ecclesiastical bodies. Concerning this, Harry J. Kreider says¹⁸ that down to the time that the synod in New York began to function in 1786 all but three of the pastors were European-trained. In the seventeenth century they received them from the Lutheran Consistorium in Amsterdam; in the first half of the eighteenth century they received several directly from Halle, one from the Palatinate, and the remainder from the Hamburg Consistory. Thereafter all of them were received by way of Pennsylvania, having been trained at Halle. Down to 1749 all but one were ordained in Europe prior to coming to America; thereafter an increasing number were ordained by the Pennsylvania Ministerium. This was also generally true for the New Jersey churches. Pastors thus received were, specifically, Gutwasser, Arensius, and Fabritius from Amsterdam; Kocherthal and Berkenmeyer, of Hamburg, from Amsterdam; Spoler and Hartwig with credentials from London; Knoll, Sommer and Johann August Wolf from Hamburg. An early example of one ordained by the Pennsylvania Ministerium for service in New Jersey was John Albert Weygand.

The independent churches in Pennsylvania seem to have been less fortunate in making satisfactory connections in Europe. The oldest German congregations were founded and developed by men who fortuitously arrived and ministered to the people. Such were Gerhard Henkel, Daniel Falckner and John Caspar Stoever, Jr.¹⁹ Henkel was very probably ordained but it is well known that neither Falckner nor Stoever were regularly ordained when they began their service. Note will be taken later of the method of their subsequent ordination. From the labors of these men the churches at New Hanover, Philadelphia, Germantown, Providence, Tulpehocken, York, Lancaster, New Holland, and Hanover benefited. An important figure in the period of beginnings in Pennsylvania was John Christian Schultze who arrived in Philadelphia in September, 1733 and left the following spring. He was the founder of the Philadelphia congregation, afterward known as St. Michael's, which he united with the congregations at Providence (the Trappe) and New Hanover. He persuaded these three congregations to send him and

18 Kreider, Harry J., *Lutheranism in Colonial New York* (New York, 1942), p. 11.

19 Jacobs, *History*, 187-8; Schmauk, T. E., *A History of the Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia, 1903), pp. 144ff.

two lay members to Europe to solicit help to build and otherwise provide for these churches. Schultze never returned from Europe.²⁰

Some of the Pennsylvania congregations were not so fortunate in their trust of certain other persons who claimed to be properly qualified for the pastoral office. Muehlenberg, upon his arrival in Philadelphia in November, 1742, found one Johann Valentine Kraft who claimed to be the accepted pastor of a fragment of the Philadelphia congregation. Muehlenberg says²¹

I had already heard of this Johann Valentine Kraft in Charlestown, that he hailed from the duchy of Zweibruecken and that he had been deposed there because of certain circumstances.

Muehlenberg easily disposed of this rival for his position, and also succeeded in reclaiming for his congregation some of those members who had followed Zinzendorf. At the same time he found that the church at New Hanover "had hired a preacher whose profession was that of quacksalver and whose name was Schmid."²² A real threat to the welfare of the struggling congregations in Pennsylvania came out of a scheme which Muehlenberg describes as follows:²³

I learned forthwith that Mr. Kraft has travelled through the whole province of Pennsylvania, appointed deacons and elders here and there, and established a general presbytery in the whole country and a special presbytery, as he called it, in Philadelphia. And besides all this, he had organized a consistory of which he was the president and Mr. Stoevert the *assessor*. The *assessor*, Stoevert, is a book-binder whom the scoundrelly collector, Schultze, appointed, *salva venia*, a so-called Lutheran preacher here in a barn, and then conferred the dignity of ordination upon his disreputable behavior. The purpose of the presbytery was to make it possible for Valentine Kraft and his *assessor* to travel around the country and carry on his trade with the Holy Sacraments. The consistory served the purpose of letting him ordain a few more lazy and drunken school masters and place them as preachers in vacant places. He enjoys great respect because our poor, ignorant Lutherans are pushed into the corner by the Moravians on the one hand, and on the other are duped by his windy boasting.

20 Jacobs, *History*, 188, 189, 193; *Halle Reports*, 1, 5, 6; Schaeffer, C. W. (translator), *Halle Reports, New Edition* (Reading, 1882), pp. 7, 8. This work consists of one volume which is entitled Vol. I, presumably of a large work of a projected translation of the *Halle Reports*. It contains the First Report, the two Continuations thereof, and all the notes and other materials attached to the same.

21 Tappert, Theodore G., and John W. Doberstein (translators), *The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg* (three volumes in progress, Philadelphia, Vol. I, 1942; Vol. II, 1945), I, 65, 66. Hereafter cited *Muh. Journ.*

22 *Ibid.*, 66.

23 *Ibid.*, 68.

A few days later Muehlenberg wrote:²⁴

Valentin Kraft wanted to make me a member of the consistory he had set up and asked me to help him ordain a worthless schoolmaster. I refused absolutely to have anything to do with the affair and earnestly advised him, . . . to refrain from this ordaining of men.

Until recognized synodical authority could be established throughout the field of Muehlenberg's work there continued to be invasions by persons who, having won the confidence of the people of outlying and destitute congregations, served them, whether they were qualified or not by some ecclesiastical authority here or in Europe, and whether they were fit persons to exercise spiritual leadership or not. So Daniel Schumacher operated in the "Blue Mountains," and ordained at least one man while he himself did not have recognized ordination.²⁵ So Peter Mischler, Andreas Wagner, Streiter, and Johann Conrad Andreae, and so the Moravian interlopers, Nyberg and Rudolph, all operated. Rudolph was active in Georgia, Maryland, and New York, as well as in Pennsylvania.²⁶

In Virginia²⁷ and Maryland the situation was the same. The first German settlers in Virginia were at first irregularly served. Later old Hebron Church did the best it could by calling the "candidate of theology," John Caspar Stoever, Sr., who in 1733 was ordained, as his son had been, by John Christian Schultze in Pennsylvania. Stoever and two lay members of the congregation later made a tour in Europe to secure funds for the advancement of their work, and also to find "an ordained minister for his assistant." On the return journey, early in 1738, Stoever died at sea. "The pastor was no more, but the work continued. The assistant, George Samuel Klug, became his successor, . . ."²⁸ Pastor Klug built Hebron Church in 1740 and served the congregation until 1764. He was succeeded by John Schwarbach who was ordained by the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1766.²⁹ Schmid whom Muehlenberg had found at New Hanover was one of the afflictions of the churches in Virginia and Maryland,³⁰ and Carl Rudolph and a Moravian, named Nicky, for a time

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 69.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 408.

²⁶ *Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States*. Proceedings of the Annual Conventions from 1748 to 1821. Compiled and Translated from Records in the Archives and from the Written Protocols (Philadelphia, 1898; hereafter cited as *Doc. Hist.*), pp. 114-8.

²⁷ Jacobs, *History*, 184-5; Schmauk, *op. cit.*, 147.

²⁸ Finck, W. J., *Lutheran Landmarks and Pioneers in America* (Philadelphia, 1917), pp. 86-88.

²⁹ *Doc. Hist.*, 101-2; *Muh. Journ.*, II, 311; Jacobs, *History*, 185.

³⁰ *Muh. Journ.*, I, 158.

disturbed the church on the Monacacy. It was because of this that Muehlenberg visited there in June, 1747 and wrote the several articles in the church book, which have already been described.^{30a}

The churches in Georgia seem to have been regularly served from Germany. Pastors Boltzius and Gronau came out from Halle, and afterward for many years Dr. Samuel Urlsperger of Augsburg was responsible for sending fully qualified men to this field.³¹ The situation was not so happy in the Carolinas. There no single migration brought in a strong nucleus of Lutherans. Lutherans rather came in smaller groups, from several directions, and over a long period of time. The churches were therefore at first entirely on their own responsibility and, as might be expected under these circumstances, had the same varied experiences as the independent churches in the other colonies. Their churchly relations were for many years clearly irregular. The first pastors were of questionable regularity of call, while at times Lutheran congregations were content to accept the ministrations of Reformed pastors. The field was large, the laborers few. Pastoral visitations, such as Boltzius, Muehlenberg, Rabenhorst, and Gerock made were too brief and contracted to leave any good permanent impressions. Some, for example Pastors J. N. Martin, J. S. Hahnbaum, and Adolph Nuessman, seem to have been regular in the calling, and were generally well qualified and acceptable. On the other hand, John Ulrich Giessendammer seems only to have been able to claim ordination in Switzerland, which was hardly Lutheran, while Gottfried Arnd, who was called to a congregation in Rowan County, North Carolina, had been ordained in South Carolina by a certain Buelow who had been a store clerk but passed himself off as a preacher; and at Indian Field Swamp in South Carolina the "preacher of the Lutherans was a young man who had brought no other credentials from Germany than 'a black coat.'" The conclusion that "All along, thus far, the people had to put up with the services of roving fanatics," is not unwarranted.³²

This is in a manner surprising since³³

... the necessities of the Lutherans in the Carolinas during the second half of the last [18th] century were provided for by a missionary organization in the University of Helmstaedt (closed in 1809), under the direction of Dr. Prof. Velthusen, in like manner as the Pennsylvania Lutherans were supplied from Halle.

30a Wentz, A. R., *History of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Frederick, Md.* (Harrisburg, 1938). On p. 91 is a direct quotation of the articles as Muehlenberg wrote them in the church record. Article 2 is given as follows: "No minister shall be admitted and permitted to preach or administer the Holy Ordinances in our Church without a lawfull Call and Certificate of His lawfull Lutheran Ordination and Examination by a Lutheran Consistory or Ministry, and without Consent of the Church Wardens."

31 Schaeffer, C. W.; *op. cit.*, 43-5; *Halle Reports*, I, 28-30.

32 Schaeffer, *op. cit.*, 50.

33 *Ibid.*, 48.

The Helmstaedt Reports resemble the Halle Reports but they are not equally satisfactory since they are not very full. It remains, therefore, as a conclusion, that the problem of pastoral supply in the Carolinas was not satisfactorily solved until synodical organization was developed in the next century.³⁴

So much must suffice to describe the means by which the earlier congregations and parishes of independent status sought to meet the standard of Article XIV respecting the regularity of the call. Time does not permit inclusion here of many more examples of which the records are full. A more complete description would include not only many more examples but also more detailed presentation of those only briefly mentioned. If time permitted, it would be of value to describe the activities of such characters as Van Dieren,³⁵ Hofgut,³⁶ Daser,³⁷ Daniel Falckner,³⁸ and many others.

These independent churches and parishes seem to have justified their independent status and to have established their true ecclesiastical authority on the basis of Article VII of the Confession, and also according to Martin Luther's well-known view that election to a particular position, not ordination, constituted the true outward or mediate call of the Church into the ministry. Their problem was always the "regularity" of this call. Here the responsibility laid upon the "congregation of saints" which decreed that the Gospel should be rightly taught and the Sacraments rightly administered rested heavily upon them. They desired true and worthy pastors. How could they "regularly call" such?

From all available evidence the congregations and parishes earnestly sought worthy and fully qualified men to whom they committed the pastoral office. It may be well claimed that Muehlenberg's complaint of the people who had set up Peter Mischler as their pastor was related to a very exceptional, if indeed not a unique, case. Expressing himself in June, 1769 on the disposition of Mischler's case by the Ministerium, he wrote:³⁹

As a matter of fact, we have no particular reason to hope that he will keep his promise, for the old devil is not going to give up his favorite Machievellian maxim, *divide et imperabis*, while he remains unbound. Moreover, his [Satan's] followers are so blind, obstinate, and mischievous that they prefer to buy such puppets and drag them in by the hair in order to vent their anger and wreak vengeance, in the name of their father [Satan], on the good cause. As far as the leaders are concerned, many of them are wont to say: 'We are fully aware that our pastor is ignorant and shallow, but it is for this very reason

34 *Ibid.*, 45-50; *Halle Reports*, I, 30-33.

35 *Muh. Journ.*, I, 237.

36 *Ibid.*, 254-5; Kreider, *op. cit.*, 60-61.

37 *Muh. Journ.*, II, 581-3.

38 Kreider, *op. cit.*, 38.

39 *Muh. Journ.*, II, 409.

that we keep him, for he serves our purpose and enables us to annoy the others, etc. This is a free country in which neither pope nor council, synod, nor coetus has any authority over us.'

The judgment and the aid of the Pennsylvania Ministerium had been recognized, and this is what was gradually coming to be the accepted way for dealing with problems of pastoral supply. The independent churches, as opportunity afforded and better understanding developed, more and more looked to the organized authority of ecclesiastical bodies which among Lutherans in America were to be known as synods. These synods found ways and means of solving the problems involved in providing pastors who were in all respects "regularly called."

This leads to consideration of the second category of Lutheran congregations or parishes in colonial days. It included those congregations or parishes which, in some manner or other, held fellowship with ecclesiastical organizations which had authority which they recognized, indeed welcomed, in order that their problems of ministerial supply, among others, might be solved.

From the beginning the Swedish churches in the Delaware Valley were closely bound to the Church of Sweden, being indeed missionary outposts. Consequently, before 1655 all of the pastors were official clergymen of the Church of Sweden. After the Dutch reconquest in that year Lars Lock continued to serve several of the churches for a number of years until he became entirely incapacitated. When the official connection with Sweden was broken, Jacob Fabritius, former pastor of the Dutch Lutheran Church in New Amsterdam, came in the 1670's and served certain of the Swedish churches until his death about 1693. He certainly was not an official Church of Sweden pastor, and it is possible that one other also served in some of these churches without ever having received Swedish orders, or indeed any kind of regular ordination. This was Abenius Zetskoorn who is said to have been ordained by Lock.⁴⁰

The second period of Swedish interest in the churches on the Delaware began in 1697 when Pastors Rudman, Bjoerk and Auren arrived and took charge. An arrangement was made at this time whereby one of the pastors was designated to preside over the others as provost. Rudman was designated as the first provost, and was considered to be qualified to act as executive for the church authorities in Sweden. Specifically to the present interest, the home authorities considered that their sanction for ordination was sufficient to validate an act of ordination by the provost and his brother ministers.⁴¹

This delegated authority was the basis for the validity and propriety of the first regular Lutheran ordination in America, indeed the first regular ordina-

40 Kreider, *op. cit.*, 21, footnote 40; 31, footnote 6.

41 Jacobs, *History*, 105-6.

tion in any church, that of Justus Falckner. Rudman's health having failed he appealed to Sweden for the appointment of a successor so that he might return home. Andrew Sandel was sent in response to this appeal, but Rudman found it desirable for him to remain in America for a time. He therefore undertook to serve the Dutch churches at New York and Albany, remaining in this position from July, 1702 to November, 1703, when, feeling unequal to the burden of the work, he prepared to give it up. He suggested Justus Falckner as his successor, pending Falckner's qualification for the pastoral office. Falckner had studied at Halle but at first shrank from assuming the responsibilities of the pastoral office. In 1700 he accompanied his older brother, Daniel, to Pennsylvania as a land agent for William Penn. Here Rudman soon became acquainted with him, and considered him well prepared and fully qualified for the ministry. He had, first, to overcome Falckner's doubts of his ability to meet the accepted formal requirements for ordination in view of all the circumstances. Rudman finally convinced him, and on November 24, 1703 in Gloria Dei Church, at the hands of Rudman, Sandel, and Bjoerk, Falckner was ordained. Sandel, as consistorial secretary, formally read out the name of the candidate and that of the charge to which he was to be ordained: "Justus Falckner, called to minister to the congregation which holds the faith of the Augsburg Confession, in the city and province of New York." Then followed the ceremony of ordination. Falckner preached his first sermon to his congregation in New York on December 12, 1703.⁴²

This, so far as is known, is the only ordination performed by the Swedish pastors. However, there seems to be no doubt that this was regular and valid. That more were not so ordained may be explained by the fact that the pastoral supply was maintained by the delegation of men from Sweden who were already properly qualified.⁴³ It was perhaps unfortunate to the end of better order in the German Churches in Pennsylvania that the services of the Swedish group were not invoked toward regularizing their ministry, at least until these German congregations were organized to administer ordination in as regular a manner.

Before describing how the German congregations did come to solve their problem, it is in point to describe two early attempts at synodical organization which, if successful, would have contributed, among other valuable results, to the solution of the problem of a regular ministerial supply. Three pastors, serving congregations in New York and New Jersey, met at Raritan, New Jersey, on August 20, 1735, and drafted a constitution. Kreider, who

42 Clark, *op. cit.*, 16-37; Sachse, J. F., *Justus Falckner, Mystic and Scholar* (Philadelphia, 1903), Chs. V and VI.

43 Jacobs, *History*, 97, 98.

has made a careful study of this constitution, in discussing it describes its provisions for ordination:

When a congregation desired to call an unordained man who resided in the province, it was to make known its intention to the church council at New York City and to the neighboring pastors and councils, all of whom were to pass on the candidate's orthodoxy, life and conduct, and his ability to preach. If he were found satisfactory in these preliminary tests, he was licensed to preach for one year, without compensation except travelling expenses, and the New York City council was to secure further evidence of his character and training from European consistories or from universities at which he had studied. If the evidence were found satisfactory, and he had proved himself capable during his year's licensure, the congregation might issue a formal call, whereupon he was to be 'examined, ordained, and inducted' into his office. Should there be but one Lutheran pastor in the province, the candidate was to be ordained by the 'Swedish Consistory in Pennsylvania,' but if there were several pastors then the ordination could take place 'in the congregation extending the call, or in the church council of New York City, by the delegated [pastors] from the three neighboring congregations.' Nothing was said of securing the approval of a European consistory.

Kreider, however, properly disclaims for this constitution significance as the basis for a synodical organization. He says that analysis of it makes clear that the government of the congregations was not democratic, since the church council, without vote of the congregations, controlled such important matters as the calling of pastors and the election of its own members. He says,

Definite forward strides were taken, it is true, in the provisions for ordaining men in America and for the calling of any assembly, but the power to ordain did not come under the jurisdiction of the assembly [synod?], and the latter was so limited in its power that it could not be considered the beginning of a synod.

Nevertheless, it may safely be said that the purposes and intentions there included mark a long step forward toward the desirable practice of arranging in some definite way for regularly calling pastors, according to the teachings of Article XIV.⁴⁴

Another early effort to achieve some form of general organization in America came out of the proposal of two laymen, Peter Kock of the Swedes, and Henry Sleydorn of the Germans. The Moravians had been active in troubling the Lutheran congregations, both Swedish and German, in the vicinity of Philadelphia. To protect the congregations against these attacks, the two laymen agreed to make their proposal of a yearly meeting of both the Swedish and the German ministers, together with a few "elders" from both parties. A meeting was accordingly held in Gloria Dei Church in May,

⁴⁴ Fortenbaugh, Robert, *The Development of the Synodical Polity of the Lutheran Church in America, to 1829* (Philadelphia, 1926), pp. 39-40. Kreider, *op. cit.*, 91.

1744, at which Mr. Kock presented a "Church Regulation" which was designed to unite forever the Swedish ministers with the German, and which was adapted to the special circumstances of the time. Difficulties over the attitude to be taken toward the Moravians, differences in church usages, and in language, and diversity in ecclesiastical connection were the rocks on which the scheme foundered, and nothing was accomplished. If even a small degree of success in this venture had been realized one of the most important considerations would have been that of improving the ministerial supply. However, it remains only as evidence of the needs of the times which were shortly to be met by the Germans in a synodical organization in which for some time the Swedes had only the kindest interest.⁴⁵

No better means of setting forth here the essential facts of the history of events leading up to the organization of the first true synodical organization in the Lutheran Church in America in August, 1748 can be found than the account in the *Halle Reports*,⁴⁶ as translated in the *Documentary History of the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States*.⁴⁷ This says:

The United Congregations were at first only the three congregations at Philadelphia, New Hanover and Providence, which together first applied to the court preacher Ziegenhagen in London, and to Prof. Dr. Francke, in Halle, requesting them to choose and call for them several able preachers. When the first preacher, Mr. Muehlenberg, arrived in Pennsylvania, the fourth congregation at Germantown united with them, and later Tulpehocken and Lancaster, with Nordkiel and Earlingstown as filials of the latter two; so also two small congregations at Upper Milford and Saccum joined the two in Providence and New Hanover as filials. The delegated elders and deacons of all these congregations, together with the preachers, appeared at this meeting, which was further attended in friendly confidence by the Swedish Provost, Mr. Sandin, and a preacher called and sent by the Honorable Ministerium at Hamburg upon the request of a congregation in Jersey. Mr. Hartwig, they having been duly invited. This more definite union had long been desired and requested by the congregations, and had, in fact, been attempted by a meeting held five years before; but the meeting was broken up by the opposition of the preacher, Nyberg, and was without results. But at this meeting everything passed off peaceably, and all the congregations mutually obligated themselves to hold as one congregation, and for this purpose to assemble once each year.

Those who thus came together had all come from Europe with official calls and regular qualifications. From Pastor Brunnholtz's "General Church Protocol,"⁴⁸ which was signed by all those present, we get the following further information,

45 Fortenbaugh, *op. cit.*, 40; Acrelius, Israel, *A History of New Sweden*, translated by W. M. Reynolds (Philadelphia, 1874), pp. 242-54.

46 *Halle Reports*, I, 150, 1.

47 *Doc. Hist.*, 3, 4.

48 *Ibid.*, 9.

We preachers who are here present, not having wandered hither of our own will, but called and necessitated, are bound to give an account to God and our conscience. We stand in connection with the Fathers in Europe. We must provide not only for ourselves, but also for our posterity, etc., etc.

For this reason when it was asked, "Why other so-called Preachers as Stoever, Streiter, Andreae and Wagner were not invited?"⁴⁹ Muehlenberg

shows that we can have no fellowship and close brotherhood with them, for 1, they decry us as Pietists, without reason; 2, they have not been sent hither, have neither an inner nor an external call; 3, they are not willing to observe the same Church Order that we do; each wants to conform to the ceremonies of his home; 4, six years' experience has taught Mr. Muehlenberg that they care for nothing but their bread; 5, they are under no Consistorium, and give no account of their official doings.

In addition to the general reasons for a meeting of like-minded church leaders to establish a permanent organization, there were at least two special reasons for calling a meeting just at this time. St. Michael's Church, Philadelphia, was ready to be dedicated, and, more to the present point of interest, the urgency of the congregation at Tulpehocken for the services of John Nicholas Kurtz made his ordination desirable.

With Muehlenberg's arrival in 1742 the connection began which was to continue for many years between Halle and certain Pennsylvania congregations, and principally from this arrangement good order was established in these congregations. Muehlenberg, seeing the need and the opportunity, pled with the Halle authorities for assistants. On January 26, 1745 the first group of such assistants arrived—one pastor and two catechists. The pastor was the Rev. Peter Brunnholtz who had been ordained at Wernigerode, and who had received a call to the Pennsylvania field, signed by G. A. Francke on April 24, 1744. Brunnholtz was immediately installed by Muehlenberg as his assistant in the four congregations then under his pastoral care. This arrangement was intended to continue only until Brunnholtz should have become acquainted with his new situation. Indeed, in June, 1745 he was given full pastoral charge of the congregations in Philadelphia and Germantown, while Muehlenberg confined his direct care to the congregations at New Hanover and Providence. John Nicholas Kurtz and John Helfrich Schaum, the catechists, were located in that capacity at New Hanover and Philadelphia, respectively. These young men were both the sons of parochial school-teachers in Germany, both had been students at the University of Halle, but both had answered the call to America before completing their studies, and so qualifying for ordination. In 1748 the Rev. John Frederick Handschuh, who had served four years as a pastor in Germany, arrived and was assigned to Lancaster.

49 *Ibid.*, 11.

Circumstances made pressing the ordination of Kurtz before that of Schaum, and in August, 1748 this was performed. This significant event can most effectively be described in Muehlenberg's own words as follows:⁵⁰

August 13. Pastor Brunnholtz, Pastor Handshue, Pastor Hartwich, and I being present we drew up the *instrumenta vocationis*, examined Mr. Kurtz, and, in the evening, had the deacons and elders of Tulpehocken who were present sign it. [HN: and also had Mr. Kurtz execute a *revers*]. The deacons and elders were hesitant and fearful concerning several points because Magister Wagner had spoken with them on the way and insinuated all sorts of prejudices. [HD. But after we had enlightened them in a kindly way, we told them that they did not have long to consider because we could ordain Mr. Kurtz anyhow and send him to Raritan. They then changed their minds and signed.]

The next day St. Michael's Church was consecrated in the morning. Muehlenberg then continues:⁵¹

In the afternoon we again went to church in procession. Pastor Hartwich preached an edifying sermon on the words, Ezek. [HN: 33:8, 'His blood will I require at thine hand']. After the sermon Provost Sandin, Pastors Hartwich, Brunnholtz, Handshue, and I [HN: together with the candidate, Mr. Kurtz, who was to be ordained] took our places about the altar, and three Reformed preachers were witnesses. The delegates from all the congregations again formed a semi-circle; one of us read the formula of ordination, [HN: and offered prayer at the close, and with the] others laid hands upon Mr. Kurtz and consecrated him [HN: to the holy ministry].

Schaum's ordination was requested by the congregation at Yorktown the next year, and this was put in process by events of June 3, 1749 in Lancaster when "we examined Mr. Schaum, completed the papers relating to the call, and had them signed by those deacons and elders from Yorktown who were present." The next day the ceremony of ordination was carried out.⁵²

Through the synodical organization effected in August, 1748 a definite beginning was made toward establishing regularity in the ministerial calling for the churches which attached themselves to the organization. As the years went by the number of such churches was gradually increased and the values and strength of the organization were admitted. This was especially true after the meeting of 1760, the time of the revival of the meetings after a lapse of a few years. In the remaining years of the colonial era three procedures can be discerned as having been followed in giving full recognition by the synodical organization of ministerial status. These will now be considered.

The first procedure was to give full recognition of ministerial status to

50 *Muh. Journ.*, I, 201.

51 *Ibid.*, 202. Papers relating to Kurtz's call, examination and ordination are conveniently found in *Doc. Hist.*, 18-23.

52 *Ibid.*, 24.

those who brought with them from Europe proper credentials of ordination and evidence of good character. The first to be so recognized were, of course, those who were themselves the founders of the organization—Muehlenberg, Sandin, Hartwig, Brunnholtz, and Handschuh. Until the end of the colonial period many others came and were recognized. Among these may be mentioned Friedrich Schultz and J. D. M. Heintzelman,⁵³ J. F. Schertlein,⁵⁴ J. C. Gerock and B. M. Hausihl,⁵⁵ the several Swedish pastors who served from time to time, including the outstanding Provost D. C. M. Wrangel, Georg Bager,⁵⁶ J. Ludwig Voight and Andreas Krug,⁵⁷ C. Emanuel Schultze,⁵⁸ J. H. Helmuth and J. F. Schmidt,⁵⁹ and John Christopher Kunze.⁶⁰ These were all so recognized, it may well be believed, in the letter and spirit of a unanimous decision in 1749 which was as follows, "No theological student or ex-preacher who has come to us without a regular call and sufficient testimonials, shall be permitted to preach, until he [shall] have been satisfactorily examined by us."^{60a}

The second procedure was to accept into fellowship such as had been performing pastoral functions at the call of local congregations, whether they were allegedly ordained or not. Two criteria seem to have been laid down respecting such persons. The first was that they must have had true calls from congregations or parishes concerned, whether formal calls or not, and the second was that they must have lived lives worthy of the high calling, and taught according to the accepted doctrines of the Church.

While, of course, he insisted upon the second of these two criteria, Muehlenberg, so far as formal qualification for the ministry was concerned, considered the first of prime importance. In a letter to his father-in-law, Conrad Weiser, dated August 6, 1747, in reply to a letter from Weiser who was distressed over the conditions in the church at Tulpehocken, and who was asking for advice, Muehlenberg said,⁶¹ "Denn wenn man Einen zum Prediger ordinirt, so muss er eine gewisse angewiesene Gemeinde haben." This may be translated: "For when a person is ordained to the ministry he must have a

53 *Ibid.*, 35.

54 *Ibid.*, 43.

55 *Ibid.*, 41.

56 *Ibid.*, 69-70.

57 *Muh. Journ.*, II, 61.

58 *Ibid.*, 277.

59 *Ibid.*, 382.

60 *Ibid.*, 433, 460.

60a *Doc. Hist.*, 26.

61 This letter is in the Collection of the Lutheran Historical Society in Gettysburg, Pa. Comment is made upon this particular sentence of the letter in *Halle Reports*, I, 49, and, in translation, in Schaeffer, *op. cit.*, 74. Another example may be found in *Muh. Journ.*, I, 465.

definite assigned congregation." This principle was maintained consistently both by himself and his associates.

It was because he met these criteria that John Caspar Stoever, Jr. was received in October, 1763 into the synodical fellowship. His case so well illustrates this second procedure that it will be worth the space and the time required to include Muehlenberg's report in full in this instance:⁶²

Several members of the Ministerium asked privately whether Pastor Stoever might join the Ministerium [HN: at this time]. Answer: Yes, if he desired it [HN: and the Ministerium consented]. Pastor Gerock arose and asked Pastor Stoever how he felt, whether he wishes to join the union. Pastor Stoever replied that it was his desire, if the aim [of the Ministerium] was the honor of God, the propagation of the pure Evangelical doctrine, and the upbuilding of our church. One member [HN: the president] replied that no wordly honor, no material interest, as also no carnal pleasure, but the honor of God and the best welfare of our congregations was the basis [HN: and aim] of our union. Mr. Stoever declared that while he was outside the union, he had taught and done as best he knew, etc. A member [HN: the president] replied that if the most holy God were to call the best [HN: of His servants] to account concerning their office and condition, not one in a thousand would be able to answer. When the votes in approbation of his reception were called for, His Reverence, Dr. de Wrangel [HN: who was asked first], replied that he had instructions from His Eminence, the Archbishop, to live in harmony with the regular *Ministerium Luth[eranium] German[icum]*, and that if we found sufficient reason for receiving Pastor Stoever he would not hinder us. The president perceived that it was unanimously approved by all the members [HN: of the Ministerium present] and extended to him hand and heart with congratulations. The rest of the members also accepted him with pleasure, laying aside all old misunderstandings.

The case of J. W. S. Schwerdtfeger illustrates yet another variation of this procedure. In the convention of 1760 a letter was read from a young preacher, Schwerdtfeger, in which he complained because he had not been invited to the Ministerium meeting. It was said that he had come into this country from Germany without a call, and without authority received ordination from several other irregular pastors. In the convention of 1762 he was present and was asked whether he was willing to undergo an examination in order to qualify to enter the ministerial fellowship. He answered that he was ready, and Provost Wrangel and Pastor Gerock were asked to examine him the next day. Apparently his examiners were satisfied with his responses to their questions for before the convention adjourned his case was considered and his reception approved. The report of the convention says:⁶³

Rev. Muehlenberg then read to him very distinctly the most important scripture passages in regard to the ministry, and then he received from all and each of the preachers

62 *Ibid.*, 688.

63 *Doc. Hist.*, 56, 59, 62.

a hearty wish of blessing. Finally Mr. Schwertfeger expressed his most humble thanks to the whole Ministerium for his reception.

The case of Paul D. Bryzelius illustrates the method of receiving into fellowship one who had ministerial standing in another denomination. Bryzelius, a Swede who had been won over to the Moravians and labored for them in Pennsylvania, expressed himself as convinced of the error of his way, and applied for acceptance as a minister by the Ministerium. He was examined and approved, and then made a formal declaration, after which "he was received into the fellowship with [HN: prayer and] candid good wishes by the members of the United Ministerium who were present."⁶⁴ Time and space does not allow description of other interesting examples furnished by J. J. Roth,⁶⁵ Peter Mischler,⁶⁶ J. F. Riess,⁶⁷ and Nicholas Hornell.⁶⁸

The third procedure was that which was in the last analysis the most important one, because it made possible the introduction of the normal mode of ministerial supply. Of course, reference is here made to ordination. It was by this means that an indigenous church was developed. It was the means of the realization of Muehlenberg's motto, *Ecclesia plantanda*.⁶⁹ Beginning with Kurtz the line was established and was continued. The following list is an indication of the operation of this procedure. Following the second synodical ordination, that of Schaum, mention can be made of those of Albert Weygand,⁷⁰ Lucas Rauss and L. H. Schrenck,⁷¹ William Kurtz,⁷² Jacob van Buschkerk,⁷³ Johannes Schwarbach,⁷⁴ C. F. Wildbahn,⁷⁵ Peter Muehlenberg,⁷⁶ and J. G. Young, Daniel Kuhn, Christian Streit, Frederick Muehlenberg, and Henry E. Muehlenberg.⁷⁷

To summarize the purpose and practice of ordination in the Pennsylvania Ministerium in colonial days it is only necessary to consider the provisions relating to the ceremony in the first written constitution of that body. The first appearance of this constitution in written form is in the "Protocol"

⁶⁴ *Muh. Journ.*, I, 443-4.

⁶⁵ *Doc. Hist.*, 71-2.

⁶⁶ *Muh. Journ.*, II, 409.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 254-6; 465.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 240; *Doc. Hist.*, 73, 93.

⁶⁹ Jacobs, *History*, 210.

⁷⁰ *Muh. Journ.*, I, 259.

⁷¹ *Doc. Hist.*, 79.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 56-8.

⁷³ *Muh. Journ.*, I, 677.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 311.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 314, 366, 370; *Doc. Hist.*, 118-9.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 105.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 122, 126-7.

begun in 1781. It is well-established, however, that the constitution had been adopted at the convention of 1778.⁷⁸ Here is the expression of the thought and experience of the first synodical body after thirty years of attention to important matters of doctrine and practice.

Any consideration of any subject of ecclesiastical significance dealt with in this first written constitution of the first Lutheran synod in America will be clearer if "Chapter First," or what is in fact a preamble, is reviewed. It is as follows:⁷⁹

We, Evangelical Lutheran Ministers of North America, who, by subscribing our names to this Constitution, do hereby declare ourselves an organized body, and, for the sake of establishing the Kingdom of Christ, whose we are and whom we serve, which can only be accomplished by unity (combined effort), and who never mean to consider ourselves otherwise, call this our Mutual Association, 'An Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium in North America,' and every meeting 'a Synodical Meeting.'

"Chapter Fourth," entitled "Of Reception into the Ministerium," specifies the methods of reception into ministerial status and conforms to the procedures described here before. Special concern is, however, at this point with ordination, and its preliminary, licensure. Since "Chapter Fourth" does not definitely confine its specifications to these procedures more is learned from a consideration of certain provisions of "Chapter Fifth," entitled "Of the Meetings of the Synod and the Business Transacted Thereat." This article clearly declares that there are matters of business which ministers and laymen together consider and decide upon, while there are others over which only the ministers have competence. Therefore Paragraphs 25 to 31 are to be understood as committing to the ministerial members the authority for licensure and ordination.

Since this is the reasoned final formulation of the procedure followed in the period of interest here, inclusion of the provisions in full at this point is justified. They are as follows:

Paragraph 25. After the transaction of matters of the kind referred to in Paragraph 21, the assembled ministers confer with one another concerning the blessings attending their labors, or the difficulties met with in their sacred office, each one also giving a detailed report of baptisms, confirmations, burials, communicants. Absent members likewise transmit this information in their letters of excuse. At this point the diaries of the licensed candidates are likewise read.

Paragraph 26. Whenever examinations, the granting of licenses, or ordinations of licensed candidates occur, these items of business are transacted immediately after the edifying conference as to official experiences and the reading of the diaries.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 154; Fortenbaugh, *op. cit.*, 41-62.

⁷⁹ *Doc. Hist.*, 165-76. This is the most accessible English translation of the constitution. All citations below are from this source,

Paragraph 27. Every candidate desiring to be received must first undergo a brief examination in the ancient languages and theology, and then only does he receive a license. Before ordination, however, the licensed candidate submits himself to a stricter examination, in which written questions are answered also in writing. The former may be called a test; the latter, an examination.⁸⁰

Paragraph 28. No license is allowed to remain in force longer than until the next convention of Synod. It can then be renewed, if deemed proper. 'Extended' will then be written underneath, with the day and date of the year, and, finally, the name of the President and the Secretary.

Paragraph 29. Candidates who have received license are allowed to preach, to catechize, to administer the Holy Sacraments, but these acts dare not be performed in any congregations beyond those designated in the document named.

Paragraph 30. That licensed candidate who is convinced that, by private application, he has advanced sufficiently to be able to undergo the examination referred to above in Paragraph 27 may, in a spirit of meekness, make known his desire to be ordained in open session, but never without the afore-mentioned conviction as to a knowledge of the ancient languages and theology. No one will in future be ordained without both these requirements, unless in a very extraordinary instance, or the most urgent necessity.

Paragraph 31. Ordination is administered according to the circumstances of the case, either publicly in the Church or in Synodical Meeting, not outside the Church, without the most weighty reasons; in fact, never in special conferences, unless it should have been committed to a committee by the entire Synod.

An interesting commentary on the purpose to improve the ministerial quality in those days when the Church had not yet provided for formal theological instruction through institutions of learning is seen in Paragraph 8 of "Chapter Fourth" which says, "Whenever a candidate has received his training from one of the United Ministers, that one, and none other, must be the one to recommend him to the President for reception."

In conclusion, it may be observed that as the colonial period came to a close the problem of ministerial supply was indeed in the process of being completely solved for the growing indigenous church here in the young nation just beginning its independent career. The first great step had been taken in establishing on a firm and permanent basis an independent ecclesiastical body. Shortly other synods were organized, subdividing geographically the growing nation, contributing to the better practice of "Ecclesiastical Order."⁸¹ As had already been discerned, so now it came to be fully recognized, however, that a "regularly called" ministry must also be an educated ministry. Private instruction partially met the need but the deficiencies of that kind of informal education were understood, and efforts were made to establish institutions for the special training and education of the ministerial candi-

80 For examples, see *Doc. Hist.*, 18-20 (J. N. Kurtz); 56-8 (Wm. Kurtz); 84-5 (Schwarbach); 126-7 (Young, Streit, F. and H. Muehlenberg); 154 (Lehman, Schroeter, and Frantz).

81 Fortenbaugh, *op. cit.*, Ch. III.

dates. Earnest and sacrificial service was given by several pioneers in this work, but the new day did not dawn until Samuel Simon Schmucker realized two of his *pia desideria* in the educational institutions at Gettysburg. With affectionate pride here today the significance of these institutions in contributing mightily to the effective application of Article XIV of the Augustana in the Lutheran Church in America is recognized.

LUTHER'S SERMON ON THE WORTHY RECEPTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

TRANSLATED BY A. B. LENTZ
Louisville, Nebraska

IN OUR United Lutheran Church we deplore the fact that only sixty-seven per cent of the confirmed membership communes in the course of a year. The 1947 Year Book statistics indicate that the United Lutheran Church has 1,296,964 confirmed members, of whom only 871,777 are communing. These statistics indicate a deplorable condition, and what is worse is the fact that of the 871,777 who do commune in the course of a year, an even greater percentage probably do not commune worthily.

What would Luther say to such a state of affairs? He would deplore it, even as we do. But more than the shortcomings in numbers, Luther would lament the want of worthy reception. Quantity does not count with Luther; indeed mathematics always was his failing and weakness. Quality is what he desires.

This is the burden of his "Sermon on the Worthy Reception of the Lord's Supper," preached on Maundy Thursday, March 28, 1521, in the Parish Church at Wittenberg. Dr. Theodore G. Tappert, in his article, "On the Translation of Martin Luther's Works," in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Vol. XIX (Oct. 1946), states that this sermon has not yet been made available in English. It is to meet this need that we offer the following translation from the Weimar Edition of Luther's Works, Volume VII, pages 692-697. In this volume the text is that of the printed copies of the sermon. The chief and original of these comes from the press of John Grunenberg of Wittenberg. This is collated, together with other printed copies from other printing houses of that day. However, a lengthier, more detailed and more elaborate copy of the sermon is extant in the Poliander Manuscript, which is given in Volume IX of the Weimar Edition, pages 640-649.

The sermon was preached in the City Church, where Luther had been the regular preacher since 1514.¹ We call it the Parish Church, because that was his parish; we could call it the University Church to distinguish it from the Castle Church, upon the doors of which Luther nailed the Ninety-five theses. The City Church, with its two spires pointing to the skies, stood in the center of the town, close to the University, in the University Square. On the Maundy Thursday when he preached this sermon he had nobility in his audience. The title page of the sermon printed by Grunenberg bears these words: "Preached in the presence of His Excellency, the Most Highborn Prince and Margrave of Brandenburg." The prince referred to is Joachim II. No other reference is made to him.

On Tuesday, March 26, Luther had received the Imperial summons to attend the Diet at Worms, together with safe-conduct good for twenty-one days.² On Maundy Thursday, March 28, he preached this sermon in regular course. On Good Friday he lectured to his class in the University. He preached again on Easter Sunday and on Easter Monday. Then on Tuesday, April 2, he began his journey to Worms. The sermon bears no indication of fear; nor is there any personal note, which would have been natural in such grave situation. Luther is here the brave knight unafraid, jousting for the truth, defending the Word of Christ.

1 B. K. Kuiper, *Martin Luther—Formative Years*, p. 220.

2 Boehmer, *Road to Reformation*, pp. 399ff.

A SERMON

on

THE WORTHY RECEPTION OF THE HOLY BODY³ of CHRIST

preached on

Maundy Thursday at Wittenberg

in the presence

OF HIS MOST EXCELLENT, MOST HIGHBORN

PRINCE and MARGRAVE OF BRANDENBURG

dedicated to

The Followers of Dr. Martin Luther

Anno Domini MDXXI

Printed by John Grunenberg of Wittenberg.

JESUS⁴

I.⁵ Those who live in open sin and who have evil intentions, such as hatred, uncleanness and the like, ought not go to the Sacrament. They should not heed the church's commandment to commune⁶ until they avoid such sins. For it is better to do the commandment of God than the commandment of the church. God has forbidden the reception of the Sacrament by such sinners; therefore it is better they stay away from the Sacrament than to go and thereby to sin against God's commandment.

II. Those also should stay away from the Sacrament who find themselves disposed to go only because the church has commanded it, or who go from force of habit; but who, if they were free to follow their own inclinations,

3 The exact translation reads: "Of the Holy True Corpse of Christ." The Latin has it better: "Corpus Christi." This is an accommodation of the printer to the usage of his time. The Germans called the Feast of Corpus Christi, "Fronleichnamsfest." Luther was so accustomed to these terms that he did not bother to correct the printer. Certainly it was not Luther's conception at this time, nor has it ever been a Lutheran conception, to think that we have fellowship with the corpse of Christ. Our fellowship is with the body of the glorified Christ, therefore the living Christ.

4 In the original edition the word "Jesus" appears at the head of each of the works, apparently an act of obedience to the command, "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus (Col. 3, 17).

5 The original has "Firstly, Secondly, Thirdly, etc.

6 The reference is to the so-called Commandments of the Church, of which there are six. The Fourth reads: "To receive worthily the blessed Eucharist at Easter or thereabouts."

would not of themselves come willingly and with desire. For the holy Sacrament requires, as St. Augustine says, "A hungry, thirsty, eager soul, that doth desire him." Those who go to the Sacrament because of the church's ordinance, or from force of habit, have neither desire nor craving for it. They fear and dread it, so that they would prefer to stay away from it, rather than to participate in it. An eager heart does not look for a commandment, nor does it wait for habit or for orders, but its own need and desire drives it to the Sacrament which it craves.

III. You say, "If this be true, then it is to be feared that very few people in the world receive the Sacrament worthily, for almost everyone comes to the Sacrament without his choosing, purely out of obedience to the church." Answer: "There is no help for it. There must be a hunger and thirst for this food and drink or else it will be harmful. Even so, as in nature when the body is sated and full, or else sick and queasy, and then partakes of too rich and too large a meal, it will languish, sicken and die; but if it be hungry and thirsty it will be glad and thrive and grow strong upon it."

IV. By compelling all people without distinction to come to the Sacrament because of the ordinance without first diligently exercising himself to bring that hunger and thirst into their hearts, the Pope does too little, yes, *de does wrong*. He thus ruins their souls, drives them to sin and nullifies the fruits of the Sacrament. Unless he were to interpret this ordinance to apply to the hungry only, that is the effect it will have. As it now is, it is truly a noxious and pernicious commandment, which should not be followed unless you are hungry for it and are driven to it without any command. But in such a case a commandment would not be necessary. For the Sacrament, yes even God himself, cannot give any one anything against his will. His gifts, great though they be, demand great hunger and desire, and recede and flee away from a forced and unwilling heart.

V. This hunger and thirst is aroused thus, when, without coercion, we show man his infirmity and want, so that he may know his misery and gain a desire to be rid of it. As when you acknowledge that you are weak in faith, cold in love, faint in hope; again when you find yourself inclined to hatred, impatience, uncleanness, avariciousness, and whatever other vice there may be, as without doubt, you will feel and find in yourself, when you rightly look at yourself. For so all the saints have found themselves. Even so, when by reason of your weakness you have consented in some of them, or have fallen, behold, the consideration and acknowledgment of your sins, if you are so minded, or if it has this effect upon you, that you would fain get rid of vice and malice, and you desire to be clean, chaste, gentle, mild, humble, believing, loving, and so forth, this is the beginning of such hunger and thirst.

VI. The greater and the more ardent this desire is within you, the more fit you will be for the Sacrament, For it is for this reason God has given his

command, that we may know our sins. And for this cause he punished some so terribly, and threatens with death and hell, with manifold pain and grief, that he may make man eager and anxious for piety and thus ready and prepared for the Sacrament. Behold then, man does not regard the ordinance of the church any more, but is glad that he may come to the Sacrament, impelled by himself and his want, and without demand or command. This is the doctrine and teaching that the Pope and his priests should promulgate among the people. And they should suspend the ordinance, so that every one may remain free to stay away from the Sacrament if he has not this desire. But now they urge only the ordinance and compel the multitude, to the great hurt of Christendom.

VII. Now, when a man has come to have this hunger and is thus ready and prepared for the sacrament, he should beware that he does not come depending upon his worthiness, nor be satisfied merely to pray for worthiness, as some do, who pray this verse, Mt. 8:8, "Lord I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; but only say the word, and (my soul will be healed)." Not that I reject this prayer. But first one should comprehend something that is much closer and more important, that is, the words of Christ wherewith he instituted the sacrament, when he says: "Take, and eat, this is my body given for you. Take and drink ye all of it, this is the cup of the new and eternal testament in my blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins." These words, though the priest speaks them privately—and would to God he spake them loudly, so that every one could clearly hear them, and in the German language—every Christian should apply to himself and pay attention to them above all else. For even as the words are addressed to all, so the priest in Christ's stead speaks to all that are about him. We should accept all of them, build upon them and doubt not that we are invited by the Lord to this rich supper.

VIII. That is what the priest betokens when he elevates the host and the cup, and the bells are jingled, which is nothing else than a reminder of the words of Christ. As though the priest and the bells were saying to us, "Hark ye, ye Christians, see here, take and eat, take and drink, that is the body and blood of Christ." So that the elevation by the priest and the jingle of the bells signifies and indicates this meaning to the laity, as though they heard loudly and clearly the words of Christ, which the priest had muttered secretly. Upon these words your hungry heart must build and put your trust in the truth of God's promise. Thereupon go to the sacrament; approach God and say, "Lord, though I am not worthy to have Thee come under my roof, yet I am deficient and desirous of Thy grace, that I may become pious, so that I have reliance upon nothing else but the words I have heard, wherein Thou dost invite me to Thy table, and dost assure unworthy me that I shall have forgiveness of sins through Thy Body and Blood, if I eat and drink of it in

this Sacrament. Amen. Dear Lord, Thy word is truth, this I doubt not; and thereupon I eat and drink with Thee; be it unto me according to Thy word. Amen."

IX. That is what it means to go to the Sacrament worthily, which worthiness does not depend upon our exertions, pains, toil, prayers or fasting, but on the words of divine truth. Now there be a few who seek to arouse such appetite, to excite such desire and delight for the Sacrament, that they invent and imagine manifold fruits of the Mass, one so, another thus; so that some of them write: "Man will not grow older under the Mass." They also claim "to be secure and happy because of the Mass they have heard that day," and they have made tomfoolery with it so long that they have made the fruits of the Mass (Sacrament) to consist merely in bodily and temporal things. For this they have no foundation save their own dreams. Hence they have left nothing that makes sense or use of these words of divine assurance. And this is just what the sacrament is. For Christ at the Supper instituted no more than these words, and has given them only for spiritual use, for the remission of sins, and for the reception of help and grace, that the human heart, clinging thereto in faith, may grow strong in all good against sin, death and Hell. By his words and his works he wants to help spiritually and eternally, not temporally. It is an insult and a dishonor to God to use it for temporal goods.

X. Hence when the priest administers the Sacrament, it should be understood that he is doing the work of which the words of Christ speak: "Take, and eat," etc., and a man should receive the Sacrament in remembrance and virtue of these words and doubt not in the least that he is being dealt with according to the meaning and intent of these same words of Christ: that most assuredly the body of Christ has been given for him, and that his blood has been shed for him, and that he is an heir of the new testament, that is, of God's grace and favor unto life eternal. Behold, this faith makes pious, drives away all sin, strengthens all that are sick, heals all evil inclinations, guards against sins, does all good. In short, the fruit of such faith is not decayed in spots but wholesome in all its parts. In such faith the Holy Ghost is given, whereby man learns to love God, as one who has herein shown him such great benefit that he becomes joyous and glad to do all good without command or law.

XI. Look you, now! How far those who have taught us to go to the Sacrament "worthily," meaning in such a manner that we should be completely pure and clean, have traveled away from the main road! They have made us timid and shy, and have changed the sweet and blessed Sacrament into a dangerous and terrible transaction, so that few people have eagerness or desire to come to the Sacrament, because they must always fear that they are not clean enough or not worthy enough. But through such fears and anxieties they become most unworthy, and their hunger and thirst are driven

out of them. For apprehensive fear and fervent desire cannot abide together. Thus by demanding that we come to the Sacrament they have hindered us from coming. If you refuse to come until you are clean and without defect, then it were better that you stay away. The Sacrament is to cleanse you and help you; but if you will not come before you are perfect, you will not require its help at all; for then you have helped yourself previously without it. That is as if you had been invited to a delicious banquet, but you glut and gorge yourself before you come, so that you must needs sit at the table with loathing and aversion as the fare is carried on the table to no purpose; and how shall that please the host?

XII. See, thus it goes. When you would compel people in the right way and seek to make them pious by commandments and laws, they only become worse. And by such management they become unwilling and reluctantly do what they do. Hence they are obstructive to God's grace and Sacrament, which he is neither minded nor willing to give to hearts urged, forced and pressed by law and command, but to those that come spontaneously, eagerly, with craving and with longing; as he says, Mt. 11:12, "From the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom of heaven has suffered violence, and men of violence take it by force." That is, as St. John reveals to the people their sins and infirmities (would that all preachers would do it), they must have the Kingdom of God and its help so abruptly and precipitously that they rush to it and take it by violence. Such spirits are loved of God, and he welcomes those that are pushed and driven to him by their sins and infirmities, as it is written,⁷ Ps. 42:1, "As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God."

XIII. Thus he entices us in Mt. 11:28, "Come to me, all who labor and are heavyladen, and I will give you rest (and help)." It is not to be believed that the Lord is speaking of bodily labor and burdens, for he helps only the souls. Therefore such words apply chiefly to the toil and moil of conscience; which is nothing else than a bad conscience over sins committed and over daily incorrigibility and inclination to sins. All these, he does not repulse, as do those who teach that we must come to the Sacrament pure and worthy; nor does he give command or compel any one. But he entices and attracts all those who are anxious and find themselves heavyladen and desire his help. One must not consider the sacrament a poison, but a medicine of the soul, as he himself says, Mt. 9:12, "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick." Everything depends upon this, that you know and feel your

⁷ The printed text of the sermon has Ps. 39; the Weimar edition has added the correction in the margin. Whether the printer or Luther made the mistake we do not know. For the sake of convenience the correct reference is printed here in the text; so too are the verse numbers of the other references to Scripture in this sermon which are given in the margin of the Weimar edition.

labor and burden, and with all your heart desire to be rid of it. See that you are worthy of the Sacrament, and if you believe, it will give you all you have need of. But now the greater part (of the people) come to it without such understanding. They bring a hungry belly and a satisfied soul; pray much before and yet do not believe; take the Sacrament, and still use it not and know not why they do it, excepting out of unwilling and reluctant obedience to the command of the church. And so they become most unfitted for the Sacrament.

Woe unto all such teachers, who are not only silent concerning such use and power of the Sacrament, but who hinder it with their daffy-dizzy driveling and scribbling. From them may God preserve us! Amen!

Finis

NOTES AND STUDIES

BESIDE THE WELL¹

ZOLTÁN TÚRÓCZY
Nyíregyháza, Hungary

I. WHAT WAS (Jn. 4:16-18)

WHAT has passed away. What has passed away has not disappeared altogether. Everybody should meet with his past once. Jesus forces us to face our past. He forced the woman of Samaria to face her past, also.

According to the conceptions of today, the woman from Samaria was an immoral woman. The fact that she had five husbands casts a suspicion on her. One who changes her life to live with men so frequently, forces us to believe that she does not marry simply to change her widowhood into a new marital status. She would have defended herself, if that were the case. The woman from Samaria was divorced five times. To make it more serious, one must know that in Samaria divorce was permissible only for adultery, and just once. It is clear, therefore, that she was an adulteress. Five men have chased her away, and now she is attached to a sixth man. This man didn't marry her. He didn't think her good enough to make her his wife, or to become a mother; he took her in as his mistress. This, briefly, is the past of the woman from Samaria, the life of a woman sunk deep into immorality.

The question arises in us: How was it possible for a woman to lower herself so far? The Scriptures do not enlighten us about the past of this woman in more details; only the mere facts are recorded. However, one who understands human life can imagine the background and the former life of this woman.

1. Once she, also, must have been a beautiful young girl. She must have filled a home with her laughter. Once she must have been the pride of her

1 Translated from the Magyar with the permission of the author by John L. E. de Papp, Buffalo, N. Y., from a reprint from the Lutheran Evangelization Series, "Facing Jesus," published by the Sylvester Printing Company, Budapest, Hungary. Based on the story of the Woman of Samaria (Jn. 4:3-43), it was delivered by Bishop Túróczy as a series of seven lectures entitled: "What was"; "What is"; "What we should have"; "What is not"; "What she receives"; "What she gives"; "What will be." "The woman of Samaria," says the translator, "is the Hungarian nation in allegory."

parents. She could not have reached her sub-standard of immoral womanhood overnight. Sin is like a slowly killing poison, spreading, increasing its destructiveness imperceptibly. Sin is like a snow avalanche. Somewhere, on the summit of a mountain, a bird touches a speck of snow, or a mountain deer kicks a pebble. It starts rolling down into the valley. On its downward way more and more snow adheres to it; it becomes larger and larger, and as it becomes larger, it gathers speed, destroying, wiping away everything in its rapid descent. The avalanche becomes so powerful that it uproots sturdy oak trees as blades of grass. The tank can not be as powerfully destructive as an avalanche of snow when it has reached its destination in the valley. It's like a formidable spire, which buries all in its fall.

It has this power although it started as a mere speck of dirt and rolled down a distance of only a few miles. So grows the sin, increasing by small fractions and gathering more and more speed. It draws to itself something which grows and inflates it.

Sin is not only dangerous because it has small beginnings, but because its course is like a spiralling stairway; no one can see its end. Only in the last moment can it be seen in its true perspective, in the full intensity of its horror; only in the last moment, when the catastrophe it has created has become an accomplished fact.

When the prodigal son started on his winding route, his pocket full of money, the city enticing him with its shining promises, he became conceited, haughty, and self-sufficient. He imagined that he was walking toward real life because he couldn't see the end of his journey. He couldn't see the pigsty at the end of the road, where he would have to satisfy his hunger from the slop in a trough. He couldn't conceive what would happen when he would be compelled to return to his abandoned home and face his deserted parents. He was unable to see the end of his sins.

Neither did the woman from Samaria think that she would arrive at the lowest grade of sinfulness, at the time when she committed her first act of disloyalty and yielded to the sinful lust of her blood. Nevertheless, she reached the depths of wickedness.

There is a story about a painter who wanted to paint a picture of the Lord's Supper. He needed models for his picture. Desiring to paint the portrait of Christ, he sought a suitable likeness. After a long search he found a young man who was the very image of purity, the corporal incarnation of a beautiful soul. He asked him to pose for the picture of Christ. The young man happily consented, and the painter used his features as the main figure in his masterpiece. The artist labored feverishly and found all the other characters, and was nearing the completion of his great work. Then he met his first obstacle. To find a character whose visage would convey the utter wicked-

ness and scheming shrewdness which have characterized the original Judas was a task next to the impossible. He laid his work aside after his futile attempt, and abandoned all hopes of ever completing it. Suddenly, one night, in front of a disreputable saloon, he saw a man grovelling in the dirt of the street, kicked, spitted, and jeered at by the passersby. The man looked like a dirty, ar-rant vagrant. His eyes could hardly conceal the inward filthiness of his soul, and animal-like instincts. The painter at once thought that this man would serve his very purpose. He took him to his home, and offered him money if he would only sit still until he painted him. As he started his work, the chosen Judas sat dumb. Suddenly, the tramp was electrified, and gazed at the picture, sobbing his heart out. The artist inquired what the trouble was. Crying hysterically, the tramp pointed his trembling finger at the figure of Jesus: "That is I. That is I. I was the young man whom you once asked to sit for the picture of Christ." And now, you would use me as a model for Judas. Oh, what has become of me? Oh, miserable sinner!"

This is the way the sin destroys man. Not at once, but gradually, imperceptibly. Who knows what a sad story this model had? He didn't think, when he first sat in the studio of the painter, that one day he would be a model for Judas' picture.

Sin does not ruin us at once. If it should destroy suddenly, it would have less victims, because men would be afraid of it, then. Sin kills slowly. Satan knows how to deal with his victims effectively. If he would have told the woman from Samaria at the time of her first sinful kiss that she would become a woman of the gutter, then she would have pushed away her enticer; but Satan is the father of lies; he destroys men gradually.

2. The second answer to why the woman from Samaria sank so low is disobedience. It is not recorded, but we are positive that the woman of Samaria had a mother. Every mother protects her child. The gaze of a mother is always more searching than the gaze of others. The mother discovers everything. It is certain that the mother of the woman from Samaria saw what extreme care her daughter lavished on beautifying and caring for her body; how she delighted in new dresses; how much time she spent combing her hair; how enchanted she was when boys surrounded her. How many times her mother must have said to her: "There will not be a good end to this. Life is not just flirting and playing; it is a much more serious reality. Watch out!" But, even during girlhood, the woman of Samaria wanted to be smarter than her mother. She wanted to know more about what was becoming. She answered her begging mother with a wave of her hand, saying that she was old fashioned and did not understand the modern world. Such was the case then and such is it now. It is possible that a child may know more than her mother now and then, but it is certain that the mother excels in one thing: there is no one who

is more loving than she and there is no one who feels more responsibility toward her child. But the woman of Samaria did not see this. She wanted to shake off discipline. Later, when her conscience accused her, she must have thought many times: "Why didn't I heed my mother's warnings and pleadings?" But it is too late to remember our mothers' injunctions when we are already in trouble.

3. The third answer to why the woman of Samaria stumbled, is because she entered into the way of secrecy.

The people of God do not conceal themselves. The children of God walk in the light. Sin is always present when somebody wants to conceal something. Adam and Eve wanted to hide away only when they had entered into the way of sin. Certainly God must have visited them many times before, and they had always been glad to see him come. They had walked hand in hand and had communicated with God and thanked him for all their joys. But as soon as they had committed their first sin, they grew afraid, and did not have anything to say to God. They were afraid to appear before him, and went into hiding. Sin always likes secrecy and concealment.

The woman of Samaria stooped so low because she was walking in secret ways. She was afraid to tell her mother about them. She did not dare to reveal her innerself to her mother, and was afraid to seek her aid. She engaged in acts that she had to hide. She believed her tempter when he said that it was possible to conceal sin, although God has clearly stated that there is no sin that will not be revealed by the searching brightness of his sun. Therefore, if you want to escape the fate of the woman of Samaria, do not think of things that you cannot utter, things that you have to hide when someone comes. Do not do anything that you could not do in front of someone. Do not walk in secret ways.

4. The woman of Samaria fell because she walked in the way of unbelief. She wasn't totally unfaithful. She had questions and problems about faith. She asked Jesus how she could worship God. She sought the righteousness of religion. Yet she still walked the way of the faithless, because faith, in the first place, is not the knowledge of God, but a decision on the side of God. The believer is not the one who knows the attributes of God but the one who is on God's side. The woman of Samaria did not decide on God's side, although God had warned her many times. No one can walk in the way of sin without receiving warnings, first. Such warnings reveal the consequences of sin. Let us remember that this woman had five divorces. Five times she must have faced her judges, and must have listened to the testimony of witnesses who were brought before the court by her husbands. What scandal and humiliation she must have faced! All this was of no avail. One sin came after another. She didn't believe in God, nor did she heed his warnings; God's admonitions were all in vain.

5. This closely ties up with the last answer: she fell because she was in bad company.

I feel certain that when she was casting her decision between God and the world, it was not an ethical decision that she made, but a personal one. She cast her lot with the world because she must have had woman friends who influenced her in that direction. She was among the company of those who preferred the street and all the things associated with the gutter. Once in a while, in clear moments, she thought of the examples before her, sad, pitiful examples, but she hoped that she would be an exception, and that she would not fall. She forgot the ancient truth that even the best of morals are corrupted by evil associates and bad company.

In the Bible story the woman of Samaria has not yet reached total perdition. The end of ruination will come only when her sixth husband has also driven her out of her home. It is possible that she has finally glutted her lustful cravings, but at the end this man may become annoyed with her also, and finally he too will abandon her. For the time being she may sell herself on the human market, but this will not last long either, and then the end will come rapidly. No one will want her any more and she will perish on the street, rag of the gutter, the cynosure of public contempt.

Jesus wants to save her. He stands in front of her and says: "Woman, no further!" My dear friend, you who were prompted by the spirit of God to read these lines, hear what Jesus says to you about the things you may have succeeded even before yourself in concealing. He warns, "No further!" On this road you will perish! Do not think that you could succeed to conceal your past. Soon, the great day of reckoning will come, and then all your sins will be revealed.

The woman of Samaria said that Jesus had told her everything. Jesus wants us to know that *everything* includes his promise: "All is finished, and all your sins are forgiven."

He puts his cross in your path, lifting it in front of your eyes, and forbidding you to pass it unheeded and unseen. Don't avoid it! Do not disregard it! Do not stumble past on your sinful way, continuing your evil past and all the wickedness *that was!*

II. WHAT IS (Jn. 4:6-7)

According to the Hebrew custom, it is six o'clock. According to our time, it is twelve. The sun casts down its scorching rays. Jesus, fatigued from his journey, sits down by the well of Jacob. It is possible that there were a few trees around it. He draws under their shady branches in order to protect himself from the unbearable heat. The disciples have begun their city-ward

journey. The city does not lie a great distance away. It is approximately a distance of one mile, but in this unbearable heat even a short journey is very trying. They would not have started to go, but their hunger compelled them to do so. Since they had no food, they went to the city to buy some.

Slowly the disciples disappear on the road. A deadly silence covers the whole scene; not even a leaf moves; you cannot even see birds; all nature is enveloped in drowsy slumber. Suddenly, as Jesus lifts his gaze, he observes a woman coming for water. Why does she come at such a time? The women of the city are not accustomed to come for water around noontime; they come mostly in the morning when it is cooler, or at night time when the heat is more tolerable. Why does she come now, when no one else is coming?

There was a time when she did not come for water around noon, either. She was there amidst the merrily chattering group of women who came to the well for water, either in the morning or in the evening, happily relating and exchanging the news of the city. Joyous laughter filled the neighborhood of the well at such times. She used to be there amongst them; but once in a while she must have observed that one of the women who came to the well cast peculiar glances at her. This began at the time of her first divorce. This gaze was so uncomfortably searching and inquiring. Later she observed that all conversation ceased as soon as she arrived at the well. As the descending frost steals into a blooming spring garden, so did the heart of every woman contract against her, as an embarrassing silence filled the air. When she approached a group of women, the group dissolved. Those who had usually a lot of time to chitchat with each other suddenly remembered that they had some very urgent business. They filled their pitchers and started on their homeward way. She was left alone. She must have acknowledged the fact that she had become an outcast, and merited their contempt.

At first she rebelled against this boycott. She thought, in spite of everything, she would have to defy public opinion and continue to go to the well at the same time as the others. She branded all those as hypocrites, who, in their self-sufficiency, cast judgment upon her. She had not yet heard what Jesus had said to the accusers of the adulteress: "Let him who is without sin among you be the first to throw a stone at her" (Jn. 8:7). But she had a feeling something similar to this. She recalled a lot of gossip about other women and felt that these women had no right to pass judgment upon her. She deluded herself for a while, hoping that the pain she felt as a consequence of public contempt would vanish, but she could not get rid of her feeling of injury. In her silent hours she must have acknowledged that they were right. She loathed herself too. She was ashamed of herself.

In the life of the woman of Samaria, the question, "*What is there?*" is answered as follows: "*Contempt and shame.*" This is the fate of all who walk in the way of sin.

1. This contempt is peculiar. First the world is contemptuous of the child of God because he does not walk in the way of sin. The relatives of Jesus said: "He is beside himself . . . and went out to seize him" (Mk. 3:21). The enthusiasm of the apostles at Pentecost was belittled: "They are filled with new wine" (Acts 2:13). Festus said to Paul: "Paul, you are mad, your great learning is turning you into insanity" (Acts 26:24).

The Scriptural truths are continued in life. The young man who pushes aside the whisky glass and is unwilling to humor his disorderly associates in a saloon is called silly and sneered at by his friends.

The young girl who reluctantly refuses to go along and be "sociable" on a petting party and behave indecently with the others is branded as old fashioned old maid. The honest businessman who scrupulously adheres to business ethics and would rather lose on a business deal than to break the laws of God is looked upon by others as a helpless and bad businessman. He who thinks that a Christian atmosphere only in church is insufficient and wants to practice Christianity with all his household and serve the Lord there too is, in most cases, regarded as a sanctimonious fool.

This, however, is only one form of contempt. The children of God must be prepared for another expression of contempt. The one who firmly stands by his faith, representing a new life in this world, is analyzed under a magnifying glass by the world. It will not rest till it finds a fault in him. It is quite possible that thousands of those who are gazing into the magnifying glass with relish and rejoice when they discover a fault possess a great many and much more serious sins themselves. They are deluding themselves, saying that their sins are permissible, and not sins at all, in reality; and, at the same time, they condemn the one they are judging as seriously guilty, even though he has committed only the smallest fraction of the sins they themselves have perpetrated. They are not inclined to recognize that the repented man is not perfect either. He differs from the other sinners only in that he is fighting against sin through the blood of Christ. Whatever sins he commits are immediately branded as intentional and inexcusable, with no recognition of the fact that his errors are only the consequences of the traps set by Satan. He is accused as a hypocrite if anything is found in his life which does not comply perfectly with everything that is expected of a child of God.

When someone thus frightened by public contempt begins to adjust himself to the world by entering upon the road of sin, the world fetes the new "convert" just as the friends of the prodigal son riotously feted him at the time when he left home. The third period of contempt commences inevitably after this.

The children of this world are never satisfied merrily to pull the children of God down to their level. They are determined to push them down much further. Through this they want to subdue the disquietude that is aroused in

their hearts by the very life and example of the children of God. With this they wish to minimize their sins before their own eyes, thus enabling themselves to continue walking in the way of sin. The friends of the prodigal son did not sink to the pig's trough, but *they* were the ones who lured him into sin, and caused him to sink so low. When he reached that fathomless depth, they expelled him from their midst and made him feel their contempt.

No one should be misled by the illusion that only those share the contempt of the world are transplanted from the community of God's children into the community of the sons of the world. Those who walk the way of sin behave similarly. They grade sins, and divide a sin into different degrees of evil; and the sinner who in this man-made grading, according to his own calculations, has not yet reached the low rung of the ladder that his fellow sinner already occupies always scorns this "inferior." This contempt is the inevitable punishment of sin in this world.

2. This contempt is intensely painful to man, and when one in his own conscience feels that he deserves such contempt it will cause deep shame. Sooner or later the man who walks in the way of sin finds himself face to face with shame.

This shame is a peculiar kind of shame. Shall light feel ashamed in front of darkness because light is clear? The pure amongst the filthy because the pure are white? The moral character among the immoral characters because he is pure? Shall man be ashamed of God? Therefore, be not ashamed that you want to be his. "For whoever is ashamed of me and of my words, of him will the Son of man be ashamed when he comes in his glory and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels" (Lk. 9:26).

Do not be ashamed that you do not want to walk in the way of sin. Be ashamed because of your sins. Be ashamed because many a time you disgrace the people of God; because, "The name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you" (Rom. 2:24). Learn to bless the name of God because the world is contemptuous toward you, and because in your endeavors to become sanctified, God renders you a blessed help. Thank God that he grants you the ability to feel ashamed; that you do not seek an excuse for yourself in the sins of others; that with your shame you are exiled from the way of life; that your associate in shame is the woman of Samaria who walks under the scorching sun seeking the living water in order that she may avoid the gaze of men. Jesus wants to converse with the people with whom men do not mix for conversation. Jesus seeks an interview with those who do not want to meet anyone in their exile. At the well of Jacob, Jesus waits for the loathed and ashamed woman of Samaria. The presence of Jesus is for the loathed and ashamed sinner just as much a reality as the contempt and shame he is called upon to face.

III. WHAT WE SHOULD HAVE

(Jn. 4:15, 19-20)

Man does not always know what he needs. He only knows what he feels he ought to have. He must have what God thinks he ought to have. He must have what man thinks he ought to have.

1. Miracle water. When Jesus asks the woman of Samaria for water, she is unwilling to give it to him. Then he says that whoever drinks from the water in the well will grow thirsty again, but he who drinks from the water which he will give will never know thirst again. This strange statement immediately awakens a desire in the woman, and she requests, "Master, give me this water that I may not thirst"; and she immediately adds her reason too, "nor come here to draw!" She asks for the miracle water in order that she may not be compelled to come again for the water. This question is not prompted by a desire to avoid work. If the other women and girls of the city were told not to go to the well for water anymore, they would be very sad. To visit the well wasn't work in the strict sense; it was partly recreation, an outlet for the closed life of the Eastern woman's world. It was a pleasant opportunity for meeting one another; it was a chance to satisfy their news-hungry imagination. Most of them would have regarded it an outright punishment if they had been forbidden to visit the well for water.

Only the woman of Samaria wanted to free herself from this obligation. For her, as we have seen, the journey to the well wasn't recreation but a walking of the gantlet, each morning and evening. And when, to avoid this, she went to the well at noontime, and was almost prostrated under the hot rays of the scorching sun and the suffocating heat of the stillness of the Eastern noontime, she was almost compelled by all of these sufferings to remember her sins and to stand face to face with them. She is not asking for the living water simply to avoid work but to solve this agonizing and torturing problem of her earthly life.

The woman of Samaria does not seek to free herself merely from her sin; she is seeking an escape from its consequences. It seems that she is reluctant to shake off her sinful life and to start anew on the road of innocence and purity, and on the way to regain her lost honor of womanhood. Her only desire now is to re-establish herself in the opinion of the world, so that people may not make her feel conscious of the fact that she has lost her honor, or at least so that she may not be compelled to recognize again and again that she is a lost and condemned woman.

The eternal aspiration of the sinful man is recognized in her effort. Every sinner is the slave of his sins. He cannot free himself, and does not *want* to free himself from them. He becomes the passionate lover of his sins, though he knows the consequences of walking in the way of sin, and although

he grows more and more aware of the evidences of his sin with each lash of its whip. Yet the sinner commits new sins in order to escape from the consequences, and in order that he may continue to live in sin. He would like to continue sinning unpunished.

The student on the verge of failing his examinations promises everything under the sun to his parents and teachers and particularly to God. In his desperate pleadings he asks that he be spared from failing just this once, but he himself does not take his promises seriously. If they let him pass, out of pure mercy, he will be just as careless in the coming year as in the previous one.

The drunkard, too, in his rare sober moments realizes the lamentable consequences of his drinking. When he sees his muddy and filthy clothes, his haggard face, and feels the symptoms of a nervous breakdown, and his glassy eyes hover over the broken furniture of his home and its shattered dishes, and the tear-reddened eyes of his wife and the frightened hiding children, then perhaps he solemnly makes a pledge that he will not drink another drop of liquor. But at the first time of temptation the desire to drink again overwhelms him, and his only pleading is confined to a sole request that he be allowed to indulge in drinking once more without punishing consequences.

The perverse adulterer does not ask God that he be freed from the lustful desire of sexual hunger. He only asks that God may protect him when the clouds of a scandal begin. Such is the vain and eternal attempt of the sinner. It is mere escapism. Jesus is not amenable. He will not perform such a miracle. The woman of Samaria does not receive the water from which she and her household could quench their thirst forever. Jesus can see clearly that by helping her to avoid punishment he would be administering only a superficial treatment. Such a cure would only alleviate the fever with a drug, but would not cure its cause. It would merely diminish the pain, not eliminate its cause. Jesus knows that the woman of Samaria, in possession of the miracle water, would sink even deeper into sin. The contempt and shame that she has to bear because of her mode of life is a constant reminder of her sin, to which she is subjected every day, as she walks to secure water in the heat of the sun. It is a living memento calling arrestingly to her: "Do not walk further on this road." The Master does not allow the sinner to sin without consequence. That is why even when he forgives our sins, he lets the punishment rest upon us as an external warning, thereby reminding us from what he saved us and exhorting us not to stumble into sin again.

The woman of Samaria thinks that her only need is the termination of her punishment. Jesus' opinion differs. He thinks that the sinner must receive punishment. For punishment, until the last day of judgment is not punishment, but mercy. "If you are left without discipline, in which all participated, then you are illegitimate children and not sons" (Heb. 12:8).

2. The woman of Samaria thinks she should have a decision delivered on a theological question.

She tries to escape into a problem of religion from the dilemma which threatens to endanger and searchingly question her moral character. She asks Jesus whether the people of Samaria are right in asserting that they should worship God on Mt. Gerizim; or are the Jews correct when they claim that they should worship God in Jerusalem?

We should not fall into the error of classifying this question as insignificant. This very question was not only a spiritedly and heatedly debated question between the Samaritans and the Jews, but it was a burning problem for all God-seeking people at that time. After the captivity, the Samaritans, who were expelled from the community by the Jews, erected a separate church and chose Mt. Gerizim as its location. The memory of historical significance was attached to it: ". . . thou shalt put the blessing upon Mount Gerizim" (Dt. 11:29; 27:12). This temple was erected around B. C. 300. It was destroyed in B. C. 129, but nevertheless, for the Samaritans, this mountain remained their chief place of worship. So the question mentioned by the woman of Samaria was centuries old, and it was a debatable question. Regardless of how important this question was, it had no significance as far as a decision regarding salvation was concerned. Jesus clearly states that in worshipping God the place is unimportant; the worship itself is the important factor. Anyone could see the clarity of this, that is, anyone who seeks the truth and not that he may be right in his assertion. The fact that the woman of Samaria switches from a personal question to an impersonal one, and turns from a delicate question to a doctrinal one, proves that she would like to avoid the substance of her sin and conceal herself in a problem. Even in the problems she is reluctant to yield to God's truth, and desires only that God may assure *her* that *she* is right.

This, also, is the perpetual endeavor of the sinful man. He wants to lead the entire question into a field of intellectual reasoning. He desires to hide behind the impersonal seeking of truth, and in the meantime would conceal the unsolvable problems of his own practical life. It is my experience that when someone tries to maneuver a spiritual conversation into a debate, and presents problems from all angles, and questions certain assertions,—in such a case, sooner or later, it becomes obvious that the trouble in that man lies not in the intellectual field but in the practical one. He does not believe in God because of his education, or cultural structure and background, or because of his thinking, and will not become the follower of Christ because of his scientific "Weltanschauung."

He cannot accept the Bible as the Word of God just because there are certain statements in it which contradict his human knowledge. These are

not the real reasons. These are only pretexts which he skillfully uses in order to avoid the personal concepts, which in turn, will undoubtedly reveal that at one point in his life he has been bound by sin, and he cannot and will not free himself from it.

Let us be careful of debatable theological questions! Just because I know something about God does not mean that I am his; just because I know the Bible does not mean that I am Biblical; just because I know the truth, that does not make me a Christian. Faith is not a truth comprehensible to the mind; it is, in every minute, a decision cast on the side of God. Faith is that human attitude which at all times and in everything yields to the right of God.

The woman of Samaria thought that she should have a decision in the Gerizim versus Jerusalem debate, and Jesus clearly saw that she must repent. Pray to God that he may give us not what we think *we ought to have*.

IV. WHAT IS NOT

(Jn. 4:17)

"The woman answered him, I have no husband" (Jn. 4:17):

"I have no husband." One short sentence, which betrays much. For what reason does the woman tell this? Why does she open up her painful wound instead of keeping silent about it? The man facing her is a total stranger to her, she never has seen him. She could easily have said that she had a husband. She could have called the man with whom she lived, and, in the meantime, could have told him, "I denied that you are not my legally wedded spouse; don't betray me." Or if the man had declined to accompany her to see Jesus, she might have said to Jesus that her husband was not at home. But she did not act in such a manner. Why did she betray herself by saying that she did not have a husband? The only explanation possible for this is that she was puzzled. Only when we are perplexed do we lose control over ourselves. At such times we involuntarily say something that under ordinary circumstances we would conceal very rigidly. We cannot say how she uttered these two words, whether her face was flushed when she looked at Jesus, or whether she said it in a cynical and impertinent manner. We do not know, but it is certain that she was in confusion, or otherwise she would not have betrayed herself.

The children of this world are more or less in confusion when they come face to face with a child of God. They lose their cynical superiority and self-sufficient attitude. They find themselves beyond the magic spell of evil and, at once, within their conscience, something cries up for the lost paradise. They begin confessing and their jealously guarded secrets are revealed.

1. What betrays this woman from her inner self? First of all, she confesses that she has no peace. She cannot forget easily that the man with

whom she lives is not her husband and she is troubled because of this fact. It is written in Isaiah (57:21) that: "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." Some people can pretend excellently that they have peace, but the moment inevitably comes when their pretence is unveiled and the fact that there is *no peace* is revealed.

I shall cite a few examples from the Bible. In Matthew 9:9-10 and Luke 5:27-29 is written the story of the commissioning of Levi, the tax collector. He sits on the bank of Lake Genesaret. He is the slave of mammon. That is the reason why he sold his honor. Whoever became a tax collector went into the enemy's camp. He must bear the stigma of a traitor. Levi must have found his business, as a traitor to his country, a flourishing one. Every one who paid the tax in his office regarded him contemptuously and wondered why he burnt his hands with the money he took away from his countrymen. Levi sat still and swept in his money. Everyone thought that this man was insensible, that the fate of his country did not bother him a bit, and that he did not worry about the misery under which his people suffered. Once a humble-faced man stops in front of him, gazes at him, and says: "Follow me." And then the cold, calculating financier, without thinking about anything, stands up and goes after Jesus. He does not bother about the fact that he is the appointed commissioner of the Roman Empire who must give an account of the money collected, and that he must turn his office over to someone else. Nothing bothers him; he goes as if he were stricken. He gathers his associates, and is happy that he can relinquish and abandon his tax collector's office. Nobody knew what battles were being fought in Levi's soul, or how he loathed himself and his profession, and how anxious he was to free himself from the tax collecting job. But now, when Jesus stops in front of him, it becomes increasingly clear to him that the man who leads a sinful life has no peace.

Let us look into another story! Saul (Acts 9:5) haughtily walks on his way, arresting the Christians. People tremble before him. They hide from him. He is on the summit of his glory when he begins his journey to Damascus. He is in possession of a warrant, authorizing him to take into custody the Christian residents not only in Jerusalem but also in Damascus. He is accompanied by soldiers who await his command. Upon nearing the outskirts of Damascus, where the buildings of the city are already visible, new and shrewd schemes take form in his mind as to how to destroy the Christians even more effectively.

Everyone would think that he is a happy man, because he is doing only what he likes and wants to do. Suddenly a light from heaven flashes about him. He falls to the ground and hears a voice saying to him: "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" So far, no one had dared to tell him, "You are pursuing the wrong course; the One you persecute is the promised Messiah! Probably the followers of Christ are right, and *you* are wrong. You are going

from house to house searching for the persecuted Christians only because your conscience is not clear and you have no peace." Then a sentence burst out spontaneously from Saul's heart,—such a statement as no one would have dared to expect from him: "Lord, what do you want me to do?" Verily, verily, the man whose soul is burdened with sin has no peace!

There is Zacchaeus, the other tax collector (Lk. 19:1-10). When the rumor reaches him that Jesus will travel through Jericho, he is unable to remain at home. Although he is a man of distinction and discrimination, unaccustomed to mingling with the crowd of the street, nevertheless he is there among the multitude, and is desperately making attempts to get a glimpse of Jesus. And when all his efforts fail him, he climbs a tree, forgetting his dignity and disregarding the sneering urchins. Now nothing is more important for him; the only thing of the utmost importance is to be able to see Jesus. "And when Jesus came to the place, he looked up and said to him, Zacchaeus, make haste and come down; for I must stay at your house today." Observe, with what agility Zacchaeus climbs down from the tree! How the haughty man humiliates himself before Christ! All this indicates that he had no peace. The day after, he made restitution to the people whom he had wronged in financial dealings. He humbly acknowledged his illegal transactions and repaid four times as much as he cheated from them. It can easily be imagined how many people coveted his position and his wealth. No one would have dreamed that he had no peace,—he who lived in a luxurious palace. But peace did not descend upon his house until Jesus said, "Today salvation has come to this house."

Let us look into the story of the sinful woman (Lk. 7:36-50), who is forcing herself into the house of Simon the Pharisee because she has learned that Jesus is there. Everyone is wondering why Jesus tolerates the presence, and even the touch of this sinning woman. It is possible that the servants of the house tried to prevent her entering into the house, but they could not discourage her. She was determined and she actually forced herself into the presence of Jesus, and fell prostrate before his feet. The people who had seen her on the street trying to entice the passersby with her base sex-appeal had thought that she was a hardened woman without a sense of modesty and honesty. No one knew that her heart was aching; no one imagined that she was bathing her bed with tears while she was bargaining for her body. At the time when Jesus appears before her, at once it becomes apparent to her that she has no peace and cannot endure any more of her adulterous life.

The disturbance in the soul does not become apparent at once. In the beginning, the prodigal son enjoyed a very pleasant feeling. On the first morning that he spent in the city he must indeed have felt good, because his father was not there to urge him to go to work. In walking on his chosen way, how many times must he have thought: "How wonderful this life is." Sud-

denly he discovered that he had run out of money. His peace, which was the peace of men, evaporated immediately—the first time he counted his money and started to figure out how long it would last. During his riotous living he and his friends were both squandering his money, but each time he parted from one of his gold coins, his hands shook as he suddenly visualized, in all vividity, the utter misery into which he would fall when he had used up all his funds.

Man feels uncomfortable in sin. This is the reason why the sinful man goes deeper and deeper into the inferno of evil life. The nerve specialists point out how much torture a man who leads an evil and criminal life has to go through. The only way that he thinks he can save himself from such a torture is by doping himself with new crimes. The man who has lost the peace of his soul submerges himself again and again in a sinful and lustful orgy of crimes, and may be compared to a sadist.

2. It is evident in the life of the woman of Samaria that she lacks not only peace, but freedom, as well.

Jesus bids her bring along her husband. Is it so unbelievable that she goes into the city and brings out the man with whom she lives? One would think that the man with whom the woman of Samaria lived would have gone to see this man who had told everything to his mistress, even if only out of mere curiosity. If he had not gone for this reason, he would have gone if she had begged him to do so. The woman of Samaria could not imagine that this man would accompany her to Jesus. She knew him to be the type of man that would neither do this out of curiosity nor just to please her. We learn from the Bible that later many men came out of the city, but this particular man was not among them. The woman of Samaria knew him to be a man of hard character.

Once the woman of Samaria had been an enticing siren who could twist every man around her finger, but now, she was merely the helpless woman servant of this man, exposed to his caprice and whims. She has no freedom. She has lacked it for a long time now. She didn't have it even at the time when she thought she possessed it. The first time she flew into the arms of the man she had enticed, or into the arms of the one who had enticed her, she thought that she was free; but that was a misconception on her part. She had no freedom even then, because the slave of sin is just a serf. We do not know those men with whom she had cohabited, but it is certain that each exchange was worse than the former one. The woman of Samaria, pursuing her sinful passion, went deeper and deeper into sin.

Why didn't she stop? Why could she not be loyal to one man and remain with him? Why didn't she terminate such a life? Why? Because she just couldn't do it. She thought that she couldn't command the dictates of her blood. "For we are not contending against the flesh and blood, but against

the principalities, against the powers, against the rulers of this present darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the high places" (Eph. 6:12). For the Lord himself says: "When a strong man, fully armed, guards his own palace, his goods are in peace; but when one stronger than he assails him and overcomes him, he takes away his armor in which he trusted, and divides his spoil" (Lk. 11:21-22).

Here is the great tragedy of every sinful man: He cannot live in sin any more; he has no peace; but he cannot stop because he has no freedom. "*I must do what I hate.*" This is the cry breaking forth from this woman, when she says: "I have no husband."

If the Lord were standing before us, and we could not conceal anything from him, should we not speak thus: "I have no peace, nor do I possess freedom."

I do not continue. Tomorrow will come, but let me say what shall follow on the morrow: Yes, you have no peace, nor freedom! Yes, woman of Samaria, you have no husband! But you have your Christ, who is the Prince of Peace, and if he frees us, then we shall really be free.

V. WHAT SHE RECEIVES (Jn. 4:25-29)

It seems that the woman of Samaria does not get anything at all. She even forgets to draw water from the well. She leaves her pitcher behind in her forgetfulness. With empty hand she runs toward the city to wake the people up from their noon siesta, and pantingly spreads the news: "Come, see a man." These signs show to the best advantage that the heart of the woman of Samaria is filled with irrepressible, overflowing, overflowing joy. Her meeting with Jesus had meant the receiving of great joy. What was that great joy?

1. She received affection, and for this her heart is full. She had received affection at other times, too. The radiant face of her mother had leaned toward her, watching her blissfully sweet slumber as she lay in her cradle. At the time, when as a sweet little girl, she had said endearing nonsenses, her happy father and mother had affectionately kissed her. But all this belongs to the past now. Since she had grown up, she had received much love, but not real affection. In the flaming and passionate love of the men she had known, she must have felt only the carnal love of the flesh, a love that did not love her, but only itself; therefore that was not real affection, it was merely selfishness. From other women she had received nothing but utter contempt. The attitude of the other women displayed only a self-sufficient haughtiness, and it did not show any sign of their recognition of the inner struggle that took place in the object of their contempt.

This is when she meets again with affection. She is standing in front of a young man, but this young man does not approach her as a young man. Instead, his approach is like that of a man who approaches another man, or rather as that of a man of God who approaches a man, or like the straightforward approach of God to man.

This man is a Jew; therefore he is her enemy. Yet, in all confidence, he is asking water from her. He does not burst out in anger, when she, filled with the ancient hatred, answers him in a shocked tone and manner.

This man is a rabbi. According to the public custom of the day, he is not supposed to converse with a woman, and especially with a strange woman. The disciples also marvel when they return to the well, that "he is talking with a woman." This young rabbi does not hold that a woman is incapable of comprehending the truths of faith. He does not think that she is acting silly when she teaches her daughters the laws. He is not a captive of the prejudice which teaches: "Rather throw the law into the fire than teach it to the woman." This rabbi does not show contempt for her, but on the contrary, he discusses serious questions with her.

This young man at the well must be a prophet. He can see the past. What human eyes can not see is not a secret for him. He sees into the future. He knows how the great national and religious questions, which have been discussed with hatred throughout centuries, and which always seemed unsolvable, shall finally be solved. He knows everything about her, he lingers on, and talks to her, a callous sinful woman.

No man had spoken to her yet in such a manner. He who talks with her now has an affection for her, affection in the most noble sense of what the word implies. His every word and look, his entire self, radiates holiness. With his mere presence he condemns every sin; yet he leans down with affection to every sinner. This man who talks with her is the friend of the sinners, not a companion or associate in sin who wants to take advantage of the sinner, but a true friend.

This affection in the heart of Jesus was not only toward the woman of Samaria. He feels, shows, and proclaims it to each and every sinner. Are you, in the judgment of men, the lowest creature? Has everyone deliberately forgotten you? Is your name mentioned only in blasphemy? Do you yourself feel that even your own people are justified in treating you like this? Be assured and understand that there is Someone who loves you. Have you rolled away from him, like the drachma of the poor woman? Has the dust covered you? Have you been trodden into the mud? Has the image of God become invisible on your face? All this has happened; yet he bends down for you, reaching into the deepest filth of sin. He reaches down for you and lifts you up with his pierced hands. He does not loathe you; you are not repulsive to

him. With his tears and blood he washes you pure white, and then he draws you into his embracing arms.

You could be a sheep lost from his flock. The muddy rain might have soiled your white fleece and filled it with dirty weeds. You may lie with broken bones on the very edge of a steep strait. You would deserve to perish there. You alone are responsible for such a tragic fate. He comes after you, climbing down. His robes are torn to pieces; a crown of thorns is forming on his forehead. He would be justified in admonishing and thoroughly castigating you for your behavior, yet he does not do anything of this sort. He embraces you instead and showers your filthy face with his tender, forgiving kisses. He loves you as much as that.

This eloquently expressed love causes joy in the heart, not only of the woman of Samaria, but in everyone's heart. It is a joy for everyone to know that he is loved. This feeling of joy is felt doubly by one who knows that he is an outcast, yet experiences love and understanding. He begins to feel that even an outcast may have some unknown quality of value.

2. The woman of Samaria received the love of the Messiah and her heart is filled with joy for this.

We do not know what conception the woman of Samaria had about the Messiah. In that age the most diversified beliefs were prevalent in the hearts of men about the Messiah. Many believed that the Messiah would right all the man-made wrongs in the world. Those whose mentality was focused on the life of this earth dreamed about a golden age. Their fondest dreams in connection with the coming of the Messiah were that there would no longer be any poverty, sickness, misery, or oppression and that every one would live in luxury. Those whose thinking was not closely attached to the things of this earth had thought that, with the arrival of the Messiah, the power of sin would be broken, that men would be better and morality would become stronger, and that life in general would be more like life than it is today. The God-centered people, who thought that Christ's mission on earth was a moral one, were expecting him to re-establish the broken relationship between men and God. They were hoping that Jesus, as High Priest, would atone for the people's sins.

The woman of Samaria does not say what she expects from the Messiah. It is certain, though, that she too expects that her sinbroken life will be rearranged and re-established through him. In today's terminology this means atonement. At the point when Jesus reveals his identity as the Messiah, it becomes clear before the woman of Samaria that the time has arrived for terminating her loathesome life, and that now she can commence life anew. In her sober moments she shed profuse tears for this turning point in her life, and there is no reason to wonder at the utter joy that overwhelms her at

this time. Everything else becomes insignificant for her and she goes out to proclaim this happy news to the whole world.

We already know more about Jesus than the woman of Samaria. We know that it is not only possible for the sinner to make peace with God but that God will create a new man out of him. We also know that Jesus atoned for our sins on the cross. Christ proved his love for the sinners, not only in the way he talked to us and felt toward us, but also by identifying himself with us sinners and suffering punishment for our condemnable sins. In his miraculous love, which lasted to the bloody sacrifice, he prepared everything for us. No longer need we, in self-torturing penitence, seek the forgiveness of God for the sins we committed in our past, because through the blood of Jesus, the wonderful message from the Bible is giving us this assurance: "Your sins are forgiven." We are not left alone in the fight of a new life. He who is stronger than the slave-keeper Satan is with us. He does not let us be tempted above and beyond our endurance.

Since the Messiah came into this world, we have a Savior in him. No one has to perish in and for his sins any more, only the unbelievers. Do you feel joy because of this wonderful assurance? Is your heart bursting like that of the woman of Samaria? Do you feel it to the extent that she did when she forgot everything—the scorching sun, her terrible thirst, her bucket, her shameful, shifting life—and remembered only one thing in her running: to shout joyfully to the entire world, "Here is the Messiah; come that you may see him"?

VI. WHAT SHE GIVES (Jn. 4:28-30, 39-42)

The question before us today is this: "What will the woman of Samaria give to Jesus?" It seems that the answer to this question is quickly forthcoming. There is only one thing that she actually leaves him—an empty bucket. This is all that she gives him. Although this bucket left there was empty, it is a wonderful symbol. It seems that the woman thinks thus: "The disciples are coming from the city loaded with food. Jesus will be engaged. It shall not be possible for me to continue my conversation with him. Therefore I shall go away, but later I shall come back." The symbol of her intention to return to Jesus is the empty bucket. Once you have talked with Jesus, you would like to remain near to him always.

Let us reflect upon the story of the Gerasene in Mark 5. When he was cleansed of the unclean spirit, the unclean spirits came out of him and entered into the swine. Then the people of Gerasa began to beg Jesus to depart from their neighborhood. As he was getting into the boat, the man who had been possessed with the demons begged him that he might go with him. It is

another question why Jesus refused him and said to him: "Go home to your friends, and tell how much the Lord has done for you, and how he has had mercy on you." The fact remains, nevertheless, that the desire to remain with Christ is evident in the man of Gerasa.

Shall we recall the two disciples, who with a heavy heart, remembering the sad tragedy of Good Friday, were walking toward Emmaus? They lacked the possession of the spirit of Easter. On their way to the city a wanderer approached and begged to be permitted to accompany them. This wanderer was Jesus Christ. While walking with them, he explained that everything had happened as it ought to have happened, in accordance with the Scriptures. In the meantime they reached their destination. Jesus wanted to continue his journey. They begged him to remain with them. It is not surprising that they wanted him to linger in their midst. They were sad till Jesus clarified the events pertaining to Good Friday. Jesus comforted them greatly.

It is not surprising to learn that the residents of the community, after hearing Jesus, begged him to remain in their midst. Here we should not fail to note that the Samaritans are asking a Jewish man to stay with them. They beg the enemy to linger on in their community. Do not forget either that it happened once, when Jesus was travelling through Samaria, that they refused him shelter. James and John became so incensed about it that they were on the verge of invoking God's aid to destroy the village and everything in it with lightning and fire. Now these Samaritans are begging Jesus to stay with them. This is a true expression of love towards Jesus. The bucket left at the well is also a sure sign of love and adherence to Jesus. It is a confession: "From the bottom of my heart, dear Jesus, I love you."

Do you have a similar feeling in your heart toward Jesus? Do you feel that you would like to possess an unswerving love for Christ? If you are in possession of such a feeling, does it not pain you that your hands are empty, that you are unable to give anything to him who gave everything for you? But do not be afraid—you cannot give more than the love of your heart. Less than that is insufficient for him. He expects you to surrender yourself to him unreservedly, to give him your sinning human heart in its entirety.

Love is not merely a feeling. Love that can remain secreted and concealed in the innermost part of the heart is not love at all. Love bursts out irrepressibly and becomes practice. This is true in regard to the woman of Samaria. In her case, love presented itself in testifying. She spoke about it, like a revelation. Love is always talkative. The lips talk about that which fills the human heart, because the lips always talk about the fullness of the heart. In this manner the woman of Samaria became the messenger of salvation.

1. She at once became a testifier to the truth, although nothing had been transformed within her. What she expected of the Messiah did not happen

to her. She remained the same old sinner. She did not feel a miraculous escape, she simply experienced an awakening hope for a new life. She does not spend any time in inner scrutiny, sounding out the reaction of her body and blood. She is anxiously awaiting her chance to proceed on her way to the city and there to proclaim the presence of the promised Messiah. When she observes that Jesus is engaged, she starts out.

If you love Jesus, proceed without any delay on your way to proclaim the truth and to testify for it. Don't wait till you hear more about him, but transmit further what you have already received. This is the way to redemption. Do not leave anyone in doubt of your love for Jesus.

2. The outstanding thing that should be noted in the example of the woman of Samaria is that, in spite of the fact that she is conscious of her uselessness as a sinner, she does not hesitate to testify. As she emerges from under the spell of the magnetic power of Jesus, she is wondering whether the people will believe her. She is skeptical about her own credibility. She is afraid that the people will say to her: "*You*, the filth of the gutter, want to convey something to us? *You* want to teach us? *You* want to lead us to repentance?" It is quite possible that she was the most disqualified person for this kind of service in the entire city.

It is also possible that she may have thought of asking the rabbi to accompany her to Jesus. The people would be more inclined to heed his voice. But she hushed away all these thoughts. She did the right thing by doing so, because sin is not an obstacle to proclaiming the truth, especially the kind of sin that I myself had already condemned, and from which I have severed all ties. The only kind of sin that is a handicap and stumbling block is sin with which I am still associated. The very fact that the woman of Samaria dares to speak about meeting Jesus proves that she has summarily ended her sinning life.

Let us recall the case of Saul. He persecuted the church. The blood of Stephen was attached to his conscience. If any one was disqualified to become an apostle, he was that person; yet he dared to assume and accept this particular service. He knew that the Jews looked upon him with suspicion and that the Christians did not trust him at all; but in spite of all these adverse opinions he dared to accept the task. He was not afraid. He condemned his past and was not afraid to talk about his persecution of the church and the fact that he himself had advocated the stoning of Stephen. He dared to talk about his sins because he had severed his connections with them.

We may relate the story of Peter. He was the most unfit person among the apostles for shepherding the sheep of the church. How can he testify the truth when three times he denied the Lord and solemnly took an oath, saying that he never knew the Lord? In spite of all this, the Lord permits him to

feed his sheep. Why? Because Peter has already lamented his sin—the betrayal of Christ. He did not conceal this fact before men, because he writes thus: “Your adversary the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour” (I Pet. 5:8).

All my self-condemned sins, with which I disgraced the community and which I have placed at the feet of Jesus, and which have been washed away by his blood, cannot prevent me from spreading the gospel. I dare to speak of the things which were and are no more.

3. The third characteristic in the life of the woman of Samaria is that she is ready and willing to go to proclaim the truth even at inconvenient times.

If anyone in the place of the woman of Samaria had thought even a little, he would, most assuredly, have asked Jesus to stay there at least until evening, in order that others might hear him also; because the suffocating noontime heat when most people were taking a siesta, or eating their midday meal, was not a convenient time for coming to hear Jesus. The people would come out when it grew cooler with the dusk, and then Jesus would have an opportunity to speak to them. This is the plan that most people would have conceived. However, the woman of Samaria does not think of this. She takes herself off in haste, running towards the city through the shimmering heat of the sun. She knocks at every house, and calls the people within: “Come out and see the prophet who is seated by the well of Jacob, for I believe that he is the promised Messiah.” How many there must have been who answered that she should leave them alone at mealtime and during such heat! But she would not let them be, and called them all the more: “Come out and see who he is.”

At other homes they might have been resting after their meal, and might have answered her in angry annoyance, telling her to let them sleep. But she persists in her plea: “Men, do not sleep; Jesus is here! You can sleep some other time, but if you fail to meet Christ now, you will never be able to see him again.” She feels responsibility for the city. She has received something that she must give away to others. It is impossible for her to remain quiet about the fact that Jesus is in the neighborhood of the city.

4. How miraculous that the witnessing of the woman of Samaria is not a mere invitation. She does not teach, she only calls: “Come and see. I cannot recount to you what he said to me. That is beyond my comprehension, but I know that he is the Christ; therefore come and be convinced yourself that he is the promised Messiah. Come and see!”

Tell me, is this so incredibly great a task? May the Lord not expect the same from you too?

5. There is another miraculous event in the life of the woman of Samaria. This she gives to the Lord also. After completing her mission she disappears from the scene. The people may still talk to her but she desists

from talking any more. She is such a wonderful proclaimer of the truth that, when Jesus appears, she fades away. She is reluctant to remain the center of interest. She does not want the people to talk about her. It is her sole desire that everyone be permitted to be convinced that Christ is there. Insignificantly she happily mingles with the surging multitude. She may be found sitting there in the crowd, happily observing the milling people. Her face is flushed in a radiant smile, her eyes are sparkling because so many people have come to hear him whom she so dearly loves: Christ, the Savior of the World. What a humility! It resembles that of John the Baptist: "He must grow, while I must diminish."

It is not important that the woman of Samaria led someone to Jesus. The important thing is that that person became a convert. The important, outstanding thing for her is not that so many people had gathered around Christ, but the fact that Christ was the center in everything. This is the joy of the best man, who is happy that the bridegroom is rejoicing. The woman of Samaria is happily rejoicing as the friend of the bridegroom.

The title of today's lecture is "What she gives." Now at this point we realize that the lecture is really about what she receives, not what she gives.

Above all, the woman of Samaria received faith. The first blessing that accrues to the witness of Christ is that God thereby confirms his faith. He blesses his faith with a new strength. First the woman talked thus: "Come and see that he is Christ," and in the end she bears witness to it that he is Christ. The question develops into a certainty. This is what she receives as her precious gift.

The other thing that she gets, and about which we shall tell you tomorrow, is a great many fellow-believers, who along with her, will now confess: "It is no longer because of your words that we believe, for we have heard ourselves, and we know that this is indeed the Savior of the world."

My friend, Christ had given everything for you and *to you*. Why not give everything for him and *to him*!

VII. WHAT WILL BE (Jn. 4:39-43)

When they had heard the witnessing of the woman of Samaria, many people believed in Christ the Lord. They begged him to remain there for two more days. This request is understandable. It is also understandable that Jesus grants this request. What a wonderful two days those must have been! During those two days almost the entire city sat at the feet of Jesus. Many were converted, and because he remained longer in their midst, more and more believed his Word. The life of the city practically stopped. Because

everyone was anxious to sit at the feet of Jesus, the merchants closed their shops and the farmer stopped his plowing.

These two days are even more wonderful when we remember that in the life of Jesus on earth this was the first mass-awakening. Jesus, in most cases, awakened only individual souls: Matthew, Peter, James, Mary Magdalene. As a rule, only one or two accepted him at a time, after listening to his teaching. That does not mean that he was not surrounded by crowds in most cases. Masses of people were always around him but it happened that many a time they needed only a miracle doctor, and not the Savior, the Christ of the World. Only in Samaria did it occur that an entire city embraced one faith.

Even this may not be considered the most wonderful miracle. The real miracle is the fact that this city does not want a miracle. It is certain that there were miserably sick people who could not be cured, deaf, blind and lame people; there were also unfortunates demented by evil spirits. They must have heard about the miraculous healing power of Christ, and still they did not bring a single sick man to Jesus. They needed only the gospel. Elsewhere, whenever Jesus' presence became known, even in his own native town, and even late at night, people had actually besieged the house in which he rested, and everyone had taken his misery to him so that he might cure it. The people of Samaria are thirsty only for the Word. They feel the same way as the "pillar-apostles" felt on the Mountain of Glorification. But when they learn that Jesus may leave them, this question presents itself to them: "What will be there after this?"

1. The first hard answer to this question is that Jesus will go away. It is impossible to perpetuate Jesus' presence in the physical sense. I cannot bind Jesus just for myself. I cannot preserve the experiences which are connected with his presence. Neither could the manna be stored away. I had to leave the tent to pick it up from the ground every day, and what manna was stored away, spoiled. Just as experiences cannot be preserved, so neither could the conference with Jesus be preserved. It might be lengthened by one or two days, but the end will finally arrive, and the wonderful scented atmosphere of Jesus will evaporate. The desire of Peter is revived in us again, and again. At each conference we can say with him: "Lord, it is good to be here!" But that is not possible. The Conference will end. The experience will fly away on wings, and Jesus will go away, too. When we are left alone by ourselves, disappointments will come in our lives as they came to the lives of the disciples when they had descended from the mountain of glorification. They were unable to cleanse a devil-possessed child. We become drowsy like the virgins who were awaiting the bridegroom. The virgins had dressed to be ready when the bridegroom came; they held their candles in their hands, but when the bridegroom was tardy, the sleepiness of this world overpowered

them, and they fell fast asleep. It happens like that. When Jesus goes away the brigands of the underworld become stronger, and Satan commences his demoniac activities. This will happen when Jesus goes away. Fights, struggles—victories mixed with frustrations and disappointments—this will occur when Jesus departs from our midst.

When we listen to crumbs of those who were present at a conference and recount to us the many disappointments and sad experiences, we cannot escape from the thought of how terrible that must be for them. The thought occurs to them as well as to us: is it worthwhile to go to a conference at all? Let me tell you, however, that even if Jesus departs from our midst, it is still worth our while to be with him. This must have been felt by the people of Samaria, too.

2. What shall happen when Jesus departs? The answer for the second time to this question is this: He will still remain with us! This is a wonderful thing indeed. When he ascends into heaven on Ascension Day, he says to his disciples: "Verily, I am with you every day!" This is his miraculous presence: he is not here, yet, he is still here. How can this be? Jesus creates a community, and he remains miraculously in that community; he remains with us and in us. Everywhere that he selects his own, he gathers them into a phalanx. He welds them together into a family, and where even two or three gather in his name, he is there amid them too. Every time they gather together they talk about him. Perhaps until now they exchanged news as to what had happened in the city. Now they are no longer interested about that. They always talk about Jesus, trying to visualize and remember what he said, and gathering the seeds of the Word to preserve them. They always talk about him!

3. Do not forget that they talk about the Jewish Christ, while they themselves are Samaritans, that is, enemies. Let us remember that the woman of Samaria was astonished when Jesus asked her for water at the well. How does a Jew dare to ask water from a Samaritan? In a community of believers, the enmity even between a Jew and Samaritan disappears. This was not the hate of an individual, this was the hatred of a community, and it went so far that the Samaritans refused to give shelter to Jews who were travelling across their land. This, for an Eastern man, is considered the gravest insult. The Jews were unwilling to walk even on the same road where the Samaritans travelled, lest the dust of the road stirred up by the Samaritans get on them. Not only were they unwilling to walk on the same way with others on earth, but they refused to walk with others even in front of God. They would not let strangers enter into their temples. In the nearness of Christ men cannot be angry with other human beings. In this miraculous community there shall be a miraculous reconciliation. Old feuds will evaporate. Men who refused to touch even the door-knobs of one another shall become

friends again. Heed, therefore, my friend, the promise and appeal: "Make peace with your brother!"

4. The woman of Samaria belongs to this community, this frivolous woman who was an outcast, and with whom they were unwilling to draw water. Now they talk to her. Not only in the exalted moment of their finding Christ do they talk to her, but later too, and voluntarily. It did not happen that they spoke to her only in the moment when she brought her message about Christ, and later forgot her. No, they were intimately associated with her in later times also. They are grateful for the glad tidings she had brought, and thanked her for it. In this Christ-awakened community contempt has ceased to spread its poisonous arrows of insult. In the nearness of Jesus everyone becomes a sinner. Everyone dismounts from the horse of his haughty self-sufficiency, and in the wonderful brotherhood at Christ's feet they all feel that they deserve chastisement. They all feel that there exists only one difference now between man and man: there is the man who has already received grace, and the man who has not found grace yet; otherwise, they are all sinners.

5. There is another thing in this blessed community. Responsibility for one another begins to take form. The newly born comes into this world as an innocent infant. He needs care. Did you ever think that among all living things in this world, only the human being comes into this world in the most unprotected, helpless manner? A plant begins to live right away, and hardly needs any care. A tiny chick is more capable to get around in the world than a little baby. If man were to come into this world like a flower he would perish right away. This is the reason why God places the child into a family and entrusts his care to man's responsibility. The parents, even at the price of sacrificing their own life, protect their child until he grows into a manhood when he can take care of himself. This also happens in the Christian community. There people become conscious of their responsibility toward one another. The spiritually reborn man is like a new born babe, and needs tender and responsible care. He must be protected, guided, and loved by all. We must love him because God has entrusted us with his care.

There is no record of how the life of the woman of Samaria formed and developed after she had met Christ. I am convinced that since the people of the city spoke to her, they also helped her to rise above the level of gutter. Perhaps those that helped her were the very ones who had previously repulsed her. If the woman of Samaria went to someone now and said: "I don't want to return to the house from which I came. I want to lead a decent life," then that someone would surely have said, "Come to my house. I will take you in." No longer did they pass judgment upon her, nor did they criticise her shelterer, now that Christ had washed her free of all her sins.

6. There is one final, wondrous answer to the question of *what will be*. This is that there will be a great awakening in Samaria. In chapter eight of the book of Acts we read of how Phillip goes down into Samaria and preaches Christ to them. Many people sit up and take notice of the preaching of the gospel. As a consequence of this eloquently convincing preaching great conversions took place. Peter and John came to marvel at it, too. Verily, God is able to achieve such great things, even through one man.

The conversion of an entire province is connected with the conversion of a sinning woman. Through the instrumentality of one man, God has wrought great things.

God can perform similar miraculous acts through you and through me. As we conclude this story we seek an answer to this question: "*What will be?*" I put an end to my narrative answering this question with another question: "*Will my existence be in conformity with what God would want my existence to be?*"

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR OUR FAITH

EMIL BRUNNER

Translated¹ by C. Umhau Wolf
Maywood, Illinois

CHRISTIANITY has been troubled since the days of Marcion by the question whether, for the sake of the pure understanding of the divine work of salvation in Jesus Christ, it is advisable not only decisively to distinguish but even to disassociate the Old Testament as the Jewish Bible from the New Testament and the true gospel. Even in those days the Christian faith was embarrassed by the Old Testament. It may be asked if the weight of tradition and devotional deference can counterbalance the dangers inherent in a full acknowledgment of the Old Testament as the original divine revelation. It is well known that the early church not only refused to accept such a position, but through the leadership of Irenaeus and Tertullian attempted to present counter-evidence. They recognized that behind such a rejection of the Old Testament there was not some especially sensitive Christian conscience but, on the contrary, a faith quite irreconcilable with Christianity. Generally

1 This was written in 1930. The translation has been made with the kind permission of the author, who desires that the pre-war date be noted. The article appeared originally in Vol. VIII of the periodical *Zwischen den Zeiten* (1930), with the title "Die Bedeutung des Alten Testaments für unsern Glauben." See also his *Revelation and Reason*, published in 1946.

throughout the history of the church the Old Testament has retained full canonicity.

Even the Reformers, who had every reason to reconsider the question of Marcion because of the use the Catholic Church had made of the Old Testament priesthood and its sacrifice, nevertheless exerted themselves more zealously and more successfully for a correct understanding of the Old Testament scriptures. They loved them more than was the case in any of the preceding centuries. In the age of the Enlightenment, which opposed everything not to be rationally comprehended, men addressed themselves understandably first of all to this portion of the Scriptures as especially irrational, superstitious, and morally corrupting.

Old Testament chronology and history, but above all the Old Testament stories of creation, paradise, the fall, and the miracles, afforded an inexhaustible field for rationalistic and scientific criticism. Old Testament theology in large measure was repugnant to the spirit of the age. Even German Idealism made no basic change in this criticism. Of course, Herder's interest in the poetical superiority of ancient Hebrew literature and the revived interest of Romanticism in primitive folklore in some measure rehabilitated the Old Testament, at least aesthetically, in the eyes of the cultured. The concept of the spiritual development of humanity according to inner law, which passed into popular thought through Herder and especially through Hegel, also was advantageous to the Israelite religion. But not even this made it possible for the Old Testament to regain its earlier position as a valid revelation of God.

Of all the great men of that time, there was only Hamann, to state it bluntly, who believed the Old Testament and strove and fought for this faith. But the stream of development passed him by and lay in quite another direction. Here Schleiermacher spoke the word which remained normative for the following century. It is significant of him, as well as important for our theme, that one who is regarded by so many as a reviver of the Christian faith, still more of Christian theology, placed the Old Testament on a level with paganism. The normative sentence in his teaching is, "Christianity indeed stands in a special historical relationship with Judaism [which for Schleiermacher signified the same as the faith of the Old Testament], but this concerns only its historical existence and development; therefore it is related to Judaism and to paganism equally."

The interest which the theology of the following period still took in the Old Testament was essentially historical. It was dominated by the statement of Schleiermacher that only in a historical and causal connection does Christianity have a closer relationship to it than to extra-biblical religions. If this opinion be true, it is thereby declared that the Old Testament has no significance for our faith! The question of historical origins is a matter for scholars but not for the believing community. So it happens, as Schleiermacher

intended, that the Old Testament has less weight as source and norm of his faith than almost any heathen religious document. One may regard the Old Testament as a very valuable historical document, one may reckon it among the highest religious voices of mankind, one may accept its significance for the rise of the Christian religion as unusually important, but all this has nothing to do with the question we have posed: the significance of the Old Testament for our faith. For faith does not inquire after religious documents, or after historical origins, but after the Word of God.

There are other final and definitive arguments against the divinity of the Old Testament behind this rejection of it by Scheiermacher, which was taken up later in a similar way by Adolph Harnack. He rejects the very heart of the Old Testament religion, not some peculiarities, not some error regarding cosmology or historical presentation. The Old Testament is to him the religion of legalism. His teaching has no place for a doctrine of the holiness of God. This concept of the holiness of God also forms the basis of Harnack's opposition. It was not by accident that his last great work was dedicated to Marcion. Here the misgivings of Marcion concerning the God of the Old Testament are revived. And among us in the Christian community these doubts are much more alive and more widely disseminated than is commonly admitted. Today there are many believers who still find the Old Testament an embarrassment, even though they would never risk voicing the opinions of Marcion or Harnack. They would be happy if it were not necessary to accept the Old Testament as the Word of God. Now these doubts are not accidental, but reveal a definite understanding of revelation and faith. This is not something quite outside the church, but it is in the community of Bible-believing, positive Christians, and at the same time it is characteristic of the thinking of modern man generally. Therefore, it is well worth while to speak of these doubts, not for their own sake but in order to clarify thereby the meaning of divine revelation in the Scriptures and the significance of the Scriptures themselves for our faith.

Let me first set up a general statement and then explain it in detail. The specific proof will appear in the course of the whole discussion. It is this: an understanding of the faith of the Old Testament is always, especially today, thoroughly decisive for our understanding of the faith of the New Testament. By this I do not mean merely the historical or genetic understanding of it. The fact that Jesus Christ arose among the Israelites and upon their soil is something which has significance for the historian but not for the believer. So also, much that is taught in the New Testament was already taught in the Old. How this teaching originated is a matter of scholarly research but not of faith. In order to understand what the Old Testament means for our faith, we must clearly separate these two viewpoints, which are so often confused. If, in direct continuity with all the Reformers' understanding of

the Bible, I should say, "Jesus Christ and the New Testament are not to be understood without the Old Testament," then I certainly mean something quite different from that which the scholars intend with their similar sounding sentence about historical relationship. I do not merely mean that the development of the New Testament cannot be understood without the Old, but I mean that the content, the very thing itself, the Word of God in the New Testament, can only be understood in relationship to the Old. This holds for all times and for every individual in every age. But we hasten to add: It holds especially for our age.

The New Testament differentiates itself from the Old Testament not only because it bears witness to the incarnation of the Word of God, fulfilling the prediction of the prophets (I mean the prediction of the whole Old Testament), but also differentiates itself in a manner tempting and perilous to our generation. The New Testament is written in Greek. It also uses Greek concepts in order to express the message of salvation in Christ. This is, however, no mere externality, but a matter of very great importance. For Greek is alive for us not only as the speech and conceptual world of the New Testament, but perhaps, looking at the spirit of this age, even more alive in Greek philosophy, Greek culture, Greek science, Greek understanding of life and the world. I note only one fact: the thinking of our classicists is more strongly determined by Hellenism than by Christianity. The Greeks are our scientific tutors. The unprecedented esteem and the great importance which science enjoys today demonstrate that the Greeks are generally, and now more than ever, the tutors of our age. Even the thinking of the common man, who knows nothing of the Greeks, is thoroughly pervaded by their thought.

Now it is strange that the gospel is offered to us in the concepts of the people whose thinking constitutes today the greatest contradiction to the content of the gospel. To mention only one example: the Greek concept of spirit, and therefore of the high and good, is of the kind which equates spirit with the abstract. Accordingly, if one would think of the Highest, of God, one must think of Him as abstractly, as non-sensually, and therefore as impersonally as possible. This in itself is a reason why the Old Testament, which is so full of anthropomorphism, is considered an unspiritual book. The identification of the spiritual and abstract is one of the most pathetic facts in our spiritual history. It is an inheritance from Hellenism. Yet it is in the language of this Hellenism that the New Testament is written. Certainly we will not say that the Ruler of history has made a mistake, that he should have delivered the whole Bible to us in Hebrew, or at least in a less dangerous language. We can fathom the divine wisdom from afar, and can understand something of the "Why." However, the fact remains: for us the Hellenistic conceptual world of the New Testament is a hindrance because it is accompanied by a temptation to Hellenize the content of the New Testament.

Whoever knows anything at all of the history of theology in the last century knows that I am not chasing a phantom. I need only remind you of the very gross Hellenization which Fichte undertook in the explanation of John's Gospel, where, because of the Logos concept, he read into it his whole mystical idealism. Thus he transformed the Son of God into an eternal idea. To this day the Gospel of John has been the greatest occasion for the Hellenistic misunderstanding. However, even what Paul has to say of the spirit, of life, and of being in Christ, etc., has in part been dominated by the rational-idealistic or the mystical-idealistic misinterpretation.

We dare not forget that the great event of the first four Christian centuries is the entrance of Christianity into the Greek cultural world. It is *a priori* self-evident and historically demonstrated that the gospel, at the first contact with the Greek spirit, both appropriated its manner of speech and took over much of its content. What the Catholic Church in an improper manner assimilated out of the Old Testament is a minor thing when compared with the Greek inheritance which she absorbed. I need mention only monasticism and neo-Platonic mysticism. But today, because of the Enlightenment and other important historical factors, above all because of the inner weakness with which the community of Christ has fought against the rationalistic culture steeped in idealism and mysticism, it is most imperative that we recognize what significance it is that the New Testament is written in the terminology of a people which has transmitted to us its idealism, rationalism, and mysticism.

Therefore I believe (and so my thesis is to be understood) that for the majority of us, if not for all, the normal way to a correct understanding of the New Testament comes by way of the Old. For in the Old Testament we enter upon a world completely unaffected by the whole Hellenistic spirit. . . .² Here we confront a God who walks on earth, who is angry, who repents, who burns with passion, who crushes the enemy. This awesome holiness of God, this strong barrier between God and world, between God and man! This absence of all logical consequence and order, all higher, finer spirituality! How much nearer to our way of thinking are the Dialogues of Plato or Indian mysticism.

This shock is beneficial. By its very strangeness the Old Testament is able to show us how foreign the proper understanding of the New Testament is to our age and for our natural thought. The peculiarly Biblical, which in the New Testament is concealed under the Greek forms, meets us unconcealed in the Old Testament. Perhaps in a certain sense it is even exaggerated therein. But this is what we need especially today. This is why the Old Testament is highly necessary for the understanding of the New.

2 We have omitted an allusion to European geography and topography which is lost to American readers—C.U.W.

All of this will be more evident if we move on to a second proposition which is even more important than the first. It is this: The Old Testament is for everyone always essential to an understanding of the New Testament. Recently in mission circles the opinion has been urged that for an Indian his Bhagavad-Gita, for a Chinese his Laotze or Confucius, for a Japanese his Buddhist literature could become the Old Testament. I shall try to demonstrate why this is a very fatal misinterpretation. This is nothing other than what we heard from Schleiermacher, that Christianity has no closer relationship to Judaism than to heathenism. One can only speak thus, if, in a suspect manner, he has blunted the specifically biblical, the whole contrast between the biblical revelation and the extra-biblical, the contrast between idealism or mysticism and the Christian Faith. I proceed now to touch upon and to single out and to explain a few thoughts of the Old Testament which appear only in the Old Testament. But without these, the New Testament is not to be understood. At the same time I shall illustrate what has been said in a general way about the contrast between the biblical and the Hellenistic.

I begin with the Beginning, with Creation and the Creator. If in the New Testament this doctrine is so seldom mentioned that Marcion could hit upon the idea that the Creator-God is the God of the Old and not of the New Testament, then the reason is that the apostles simply assumed the preaching of God the Creator. Diligent reading of the Old Testament played a very large role in the new community, already at its founding, as we hear from the Beroeans. The teaching that God is the Creator and that the world and we are his creation, and all that this means, is expressed only infrequently and occasionally in the New Testament, although with a marked deepening of the Old Testament concept.

This doctrine is, however, the foundation for everything else. The story of Creation in Genesis I is not only the *initium* but the *principium* of all that follows. Still, we must mark how the Old Testament speaks of the Creator—not as the theology of the Enlightenment and the songs of Gellert, for that is how Aristotle speaks of him. It is not as the God who is known from nature, but as the One who reveals himself as the Lord of his people through historical manifestations and through the prophetic Word. Before Israel recognized God the world-creator, they recognized God as their Lord. He is also our Lord, not because he is recognized from nature as the Artificer of this universe; but rather, because he reveals himself as our Lord, as the Absolute Lord beside whom there is none other for us, he must also be the Lord of all the world. The acknowledgment of the Creator belongs not to *natural* but to *revealed* theology.

Yes, and even more. Only because he is the Creator in this biblical sense, is there any revelation. He is only known by revelation. In so far as reason, desiring to know God from nature, would understand God, he is really not

the Absolute Lord of the world, but One who, so to speak, is part of it, who is even as little to be thought of without the world as the world without him. Or, from man's standpoint, he is merely the One who in the depth of man's nature can be recognized as the ultimate depth, who is the basis binding Ego to Ego as well as the Ego to himself. Such a God is not the Lord, neither my Lord nor the world's Lord! Rather, the Lord and Creator is he whom man can know only because and in so far as he reveals himself. Outside of and disregarding this revelation, however, he is the Unknown. For the world is not as he, and he is not as the world. Therefore no image, nor likeness can be made of him. The second commandment, which to all aesthetic thinkers is an especial offense of the Old Testament, is for the Old Testament prophets of decisive significance as the differential between their God and the heathen gods. God and world, God and creature are absolutely distinct. God and world do not run into one another: there is no transition from one to the other. Here is the absolute super-worldliness of God, his sovereignty over it. The world is absolutely unlike him for he is its creator and it is his creation. It is wholly and completely conditioned by him, founded on him and derived from him, but he is in no way conditioned by it. He does not need the world, but it is nothing without him.

It is imperative that we make clear to ourselves this content of the doctrine of creation in the Old Testament, in order, on the one hand, to distinguish this concept of creation from that which is so often understood by religion and philosophy under this head. The Creator as he makes himself known in the Old Testament is known by no philosophy or religion. On the other hand, it is imperative, because only by this influential teaching can we ever understand what it means that God became man and so bridged the gap between himself and his creation. One must proceed from Isaiah in order not to misunderstand the Gospel of John! This thought is comprehended in the teaching of the Old Testament concerning the holiness of God, so well known and yet so little understood. The Holy One of Israel is even this sovereign Lord, whose will is the basis of all things and whose will knows no "Why." So he speaks and it is done. So he commands and it is so. He chooses whom he will and is merciful to whom he will.

If I said, "Man knows this God only through revelation, not from the world," so I could just as well say, "Man has this God by election and grace and not by nature." Therefore, Israel had this God, who is so different from the gods of others, because Israel is the chosen people. That is not, as one often supposes today, an expression of national pride, but quite the opposite. For all other people the God-relationship is a matter of course: they have their God because they are what they are, and they conceive of him according to their own nature. But Israel knows, however, that it has and knows its God solely because it has pleased God to show himself to this people. There-

fore the election, a special turn of the will of God toward them, is the basis of their God-relationship, and not natural necessity. The God-relationship rests on freedom, not on necessity—on God's gracious will alone, and therefore surely not on what the people are in themselves. Again, that is the meaning of the expression, the Holy One of Israel: the God over whom no man disposes, because he alone disposes of us; the God who so completely rules his chosen people that he can cast them away even as he has accepted them. Here the natural bond which often unites God and man, not only in crass heathenism but also in all philosophical and mystical teachings about God, is torn apart and in its place the bond of union is established by freedom.

Still a final word is to be said in order to understand the concept of God which is the fundamental principle of the Old Testament. We say, "God makes himself known by special revelation." That is, strictly speaking, in historical revelation, in historical self-disclosure. Not, however, as we often say today, "God in history." For in that case we make history a commonplace in which God always and all along discloses himself. The very opposite is intended: in history, in which God is not throughout constantly revealed, he reveals himself at specific points, in particular events, in his own personal Word, through particular persons who declare his Word. Again, we should not confuse, as is so frequently done today, this prophetic Word of God with ordinary religious or moral ideas. Were it only that, then the prophets were not prophets, God's heralds, but they were merely religious or moral geniuses who first discovered a truth which afterwards became a common possession. The prophetic Word can never become commonplace, while the word of genius validates itself in that it soon becomes common property. The prophetic Word always remains united with the person of the prophets, or rather with his particular divine authority. It does not depend on what the prophet says, but on his having said it by divine authority. Or, what is the same thing, the significance of his speaking is that no one else dares to speak as he does because no other has the commission, because no other dare say, "God says this."

Why is this distinction so important? Because only thereby and therein can God be recognized as the personal God. If one knows nothing of God other than general ideas, then one does not know him as the personal God, but as the Idea of Ideas. Ideas are not personal. Ideas I can speak myself. Idea is simply that which I can speak of myself. A personal word, a personal encounter, however, is that for which an Absolute Thou is needed. Yes, it is that whereby the existence and confrontation of the Thou is the essential thing. Personal relationship never comes through ideas, because one alone is enough for the thinking of an idea. Revelation is no solitary non-personal speculation about God, but revelation is being addressed by God, who speaks as my "Thou." Therefore the word of prophets is always real, that is, in a particular situation to particular persons. It is essential for this word that

it be an historical fact, an event. Thereby God shows himself to be One who does not wait for men to come to him, as the platonic God-idea or the mystical divine being waits, but One who plunges into the midst of man's history and personally encounters men in their activity. Such is the personal, living God of the Old Testament.

All that has been said up to now belongs of necessity together, so much so that one can say it is always the same from another side: God the Creator, God the Lord, God who chooses, God who encounters personally. But likewise, something further is necessary. Along with the teaching that God personally encounters men in their activity and speaks *ad hominem*, "Thou art the man," there is clearly evident something which even the most superficial critic of the Old Testament cannot help specifically to notice: the scroll of divine law. In the law God speaks, he raises a claim; therein he elects and he says, "Thou art mine." The fact that God is known as powerful will and not as world-idea, signifies that God earnestly seeks my life, and that means my will. This will he claims for himself in order to bind my life to himself. There is, therefore, no philosophy in the Old Testament. Over against a God who is will, philosophizing ceases. For God's call must be answered with life, with deed. Again we must reject a modern weakening of this thought. It is said, "The religion of the Old Testament belongs to the category of moral religion." "The prophets validate the common moral law." No! That is exactly what they do not do! The prophets do not know a moral law. They do not recognize a morality derived from any law of reason. They recognize only one thing: obedience to the personal God.

This obedience can desire under certain circumstances the very opposite of that which common moral law requires. Abraham is a paradigm of God-obedience, but certainly not of an ethical man. The divine will, just because He is personal will, is not confined to the law of reason. Whoever would discover a moral religion, should go to the Stoics, since in the Old Testament he can find it only by some misinterpretation. For even here, "God permits himself to be caught in no abstraction." The moral law, however, is an abstraction. It also means to be free. In itself the moral law appears as valid, independent of the will of God. Just such a freedom is considered in the Old Testament as the true sin. There is nothing which of itself is morally good. Good is only this: Do God's will because it is God's will. Unfortunately this thought is overshadowed in church doctrine and also in the Reformation through the fatal identification of the Old Testament law with the law of reason. It is especially Calvin, who departing from Luther here as in other instances, has apprehended the Old Testament more clearly.

For all of that, even Luther has clearly put at the center of his thinking a decisive thought of the Old Testament: the distinction between righteousness and faith. God's challenge is certainly demand. However, it is not demand first

and foremost. Over and beyond being a demand, it is also an expression of divine grace. God gives before he requires. And his demand, rightly understood, is that one receive what he wills to give. The sense of the whole law is simply this: "You shall be God's people." The law of God is an instance of his covenant. Of the idea that God concludes a covenant with his people philosophical morality knows nothing. It can understand the law only legalistically. The Old Testament, however, teaches us that law is to be understood primarily as God's gift of grace. Always the prophets show, and the later law also, that the demand for obedience to God is an issue of his election, of his gracious initiation for his people. First the gift, then the response.³ Truly, this "then" is not temporal. Gift and response are not to be separated from one another. It is the same act in which God comes to encounter his people, and in which they meet him.

In saying this we say also that the concepts of the holiness of God and of his mercy and love are absolutely not to be separated from one another, although they must be distinguished. Holiness is the very real self of God: that God can will nothing contrary to himself, and to the happenings of his will. To stand outside of this will and against this will spells damnation. Love means that God, in that which he himself wills, clearly desires us. This is clearly his inexorable will, that we be his. As the Holy One he comes to encounter his people because they fall away from him. But behind this encounter stands and is actualized in him his confrontation; for he will have nothing else than to draw the people to himself. There would be no objection should one attempt to express the difference between the Old Testament and all other teachings about God by saying that only in the Old Testament are the holiness and the love of God thought of as one, without the one weakening the other. As only the supermundane God can be truly personal, so also only the Holy God can be truly loving.

Both of these are manifested in the fact that the will of God is directed toward a goal. The covenant is not a stabilization or an eternalization of that which is. The covenant of God is already prospective in the covenant which he concluded with Abraham. The Old Testament is through and through eschatological. It concerns itself with the divine future, with the future in a literal sense.⁴ God will come to his people in quite another way than he is present now. This is the one great concern of the prophets. Yet this does not mean a general teleology of history, a thought of historical progress. The world does not move automatically by inner compulsion to a higher goal. That comes through struggle, repudiation, and re-creation. The optimistic evolutionary thought sees everything pressing toward a goal: it would have the

3 Gabe-Aufgabe.

4 Zu-kunft.

evil always less, the good always more. Of such a concept the Old Testament is ignorant. Rather, it knows the thoughts of judgment, of freedom, of divine choice, and also the freedom of human decision. Whoever is untrue to God has nothing good to expect; the sin, or rather the sinner is threatened with judgment. To be sure, God does not will that. His real will is the will to save, forgive, deliver, re-create. This will of God would not be his earnest will, however, if behind the love of God there did not stand his inviolable Holiness, if God did not earnestly let us know that he will not be mocked.

The judgment concept of the Old Testament, like the creator-doctrine, appears only seldom in the New Testament and is there substantially materialized and thus accented. But it is the presupposition for the understanding of the New Testament. How can one concern oneself about redemption and atonement if one does not know the anguish of damnation?

The experience of the preacher also shows how easily the reader of the New Testament fails to hear the thought of judgment therein and considers it purely Old Testament; because the doctrine of the love of God and forgiveness alone enters his thinking. Here the need for the Old Testament is quite apparent. Without it, the peril is great, as threatened to happen through Marcion, that the gospel of God's love may become a sentimentality. Such is often the case today.

With this doctrine of eschatology, End-hope, we have mentioned that which separates most radically the world of the Bible from the world of the Greeks and moderns. Or better put, it is the point at which the thoroughgoing and all-pervading opposition to such thinking most clearly appears. The eschatology of the Old Testament is of necessity linked with its concept of God. Because God is holy and merciful, he wills that all lands be full of his glory and that the lives of men be blessed and holy. The Creator who created the world by his Word wills also that his Word fill and govern the world. The Lord who chose for himself a people desires that this people be wholly his people, and that through them all the peoples of the earth may be blessed. The God who is completely personal will also dwell fully with his people. But that which he desires has not yet come to pass. The unholy reality does not correspond with the Holy God. Measured by the holy will of God, reality appears not as something imperfect, but rebellious. Measuring himself according to the law of God, man recognizes himself as a sinner; God's pardoning grace reminds him that he is unfaithful, a rebel.

This contradiction is unbearable whenever God is philosophized about. Thinking must resolve it, and must justify the world as it is out of the idea of God. But, since the world is not yet in agreement with the Divine Will, speculation discloses the information that the world, being finite for not being God, must necessarily be imperfect. Finite, natural concrete existence is thereby marked out as something which really ought not to be. Salvation could consist

in nothing else than the abrogation of this finite world, if such thinking is followed. But to all this the Old Testament teaching is diametrically opposed. The not-being-as-it-ought-to-be⁵ does not consist in the finiteness as such. For God is the Creator even of the finite world, and as his creation it is good. Not something negative, the lack of being like God, is evil, but rather something quite positive: opposition toward God. Not the worldliness, the natural being, and natural desire as such are evil; they become evil only when torn out of relation with the Creator. Therefore evil is not something inherent in the world, and thus a matter of course, but it is a disruption of the divine order in the world through man's rebellion against God. The thought of God, therefore, is not a means to explain or to justify the present state of the world, but on the contrary: through the acknowledgment of God, the conviction arises that the world, that man, is not as he should be, that life as it stands is in opposition to God. Throughout the Old Testament there is the awareness of this opposition. It is the presupposition of the End-hope. The Old Testament eschatology is understandable only against the background of this contradiction. Though God is the Creator of the world, nevertheless the world, through the will of man who has turned away from God, is far from God. Therefore, God who is Holy and self-asserting, will make the faithless world subject to him again, and will bring the distant world to himself again by drawing near to it himself.

The teaching which fulfills Old Testament prophecy is that of a coming God and of the coming of the Kingdom of God. The prophet is the herald of this divine future. Only from this future is his whole pronouncement to be comprehended. For in it is the meaning, goal and urgency of prophecy. The prophet knows himself as the Vanguard of God, as the forerunner of coming things. The historicity of this prophetic revelation is therefore not national history and not world history, but is to be comprehended only as end-history. That which makes the historical moment, in such an outstanding manner, into a moment of decision is nothing other than this end-reference and therefore end-validity of the present Word. The historical "now" receives its absolute earnestness from the end of all things. Only from thence are possible the tremendous imperatives of the prophetic call. So it becomes evident to us from a new side how wrong it is to liken the prophetic ethos to a rational moral idea. What does moral idealism know of the end-judgment! What does the rational thinker understand of this simultaneous enticing and threatening, of this intermingling of announcement of judgment and promise of the future? This becomes so starkly evident in the utterances of Hosea. The prophet and his preaching constitute already an eschatological fact, a moment in the movement of God toward the world,

Yes, toward the world, not away from the world! The movement away from the world, the fleeing out of the world of finitude into the eternity, worldlessness and impersonalism⁶ of God is the movement of idealism and mysticism, of the Greek religion: salvation *from* the world. The practical expression of this thought is found in asceticism. Spirit stands in opposition to the earthly and natural, to the manifold, the concrete and the personal. Salvation therefore can only be the surrender of the individual to the general, as God himself is only to be found in the abstraction of idea and in the vagueness of mystical feeling. Of this world-escaping, world-denying ascetic direction, the Old Testament knows nothing. Nothing, because God is not the dormant idea over being, but he is the world-Creator who loves and seeks his world. Therefore the Old Testament is full of world-affirmation, yes one could say full of worldliness! As God himself is no abstraction but a person with will, love and hate, mercy and anger, so also his relationship to the world is not negative, but thoroughly positive, even when he is the accuser and judge of all men and conditions. God is with the world in spite of it! In it, not outside of it he will rule. In it will be his Kingdom.

The worldliness of the prophetic eschatology is so strongly expressed—compare it once with the religious views of India or even with Plato or Plotinus! It has the appearance in the prophets as if they were not concerned about an ultimate end-history, but only about an historical goal. But it is clearly this very “cursed Jewish optimism,” as Schopenhauer expressed it, and this “wholly eudaemonistic worldliness” which is clearly necessary in order that the concept of the Kingdom of God in the New Testament may be secured from Schopenhauer and other misconceptions which would make it something akin to a sort of buddhistic-mystical Nirvana. Above all, the realism of the Old Testament is essential in order rightly to appreciate and to teach the reality of the more spiritual expressions of the New Testament. The salvation of the world in the Kingdom of heaven signifies not a Platonic hereafter, the idealistic immortality of the soul, but includes the physical. The world does not disintegrate but shall be complete. That all this is also intended in the New Testament can be understood only against the background of the Old Testament prophetic hope.

In closest connection with the eschatological realism, there is another thought which we have only lightly touched. It may have been puzzling to many that I have always called the people of Israel the recipient of the divine call. Men have often tried to dismiss this as an imperfection of the Old Testament over against the New, since the right spiritual religion for them must have to do with the individual. This misconception arises from the same source as those mentioned above. It is the idealistic mystical individualism which is

6 Du-Iosigkeit.

guilty. Certainly the calls to repentance and the promises of the Old Testament are directed toward the individual. King David clearly recognized this when the prophet Nathan struck him to the heart as with the sword of God, "Thou art the man." How can the call to repentance of the prophets be understood other than as a summons to the individuals?

Nevertheless, it is of greatest significance that the prophets always speak to the whole people. For God who will build his Kingdom on earth, who begins in history this eternal movement, has to do with the whole group not merely with the individual: with the people and with the individual only in so far as he is a member of the people. In the New Testament this people is called the Church, and in the New Testament one is still conscious that "ecclesia" is only a translation of the Old Testament phrase "people of God." God's will is directed from the beginning toward the community. He sees mankind as united solidarily without prejudice to the fact that he deals with the individual in his conscience. God even desires that they be not individuals but a part of the whole. Precisely this isolationism⁷ is the sin. The Old Testament ethic is wholly and completely social ethics. Sin is, in so far as its concrete appearance comes into question, above all the sin against the fellowman, the wrong toward others, the denial of solidarity. In all mystical idealistic religions, however, sin is primarily the lack of self-control, worldliness.

This conception plays a wholly subordinate role in the Old Testament over against sin as evil against a brother, as denial of the "thou." The peculiar character of the Old Testament here comes to a head decisively. One sins not, as the Greek, the ascetics or the mystics conceive, against oneself; but man sins against others by transgressions of the divine bounds which protect them. Thus goodness is related to community; it is the right-relationship to one's brother, the love of one's neighbor, not some kind of ascetic purity. Sexual ethics also is determined not by the idea of purity, but by the concept of community.

The Old Testament is laden with a tremendous pathos for the concept of community, by a strong social ethic, the like of which the world does not know; not, however, in the sense of a common ethical social idea, but solely and alone dominated by the thought of divine righteousness, divine order, divine lordship. God will have a right people of God on earth. A people of God cannot arise out of the fact that there are individual pious people who because of their piety also compose the right community, but piety is established from the outset as a matter of community. God and neighbor belong inseparably together. God has deposited his Word in the community of the people. One must be an Israelite to know about God. There is no private revelation. There is revelation of the Living God only in living relationship with the people. God conceals his Word and his salvation behind the men

7 Einzelsein.

called by him so that any who would find him, must likewise find other men. And the Word which is thus found is a Word which binds the recipient to the community.

So we account for the astounding fact that in Israel there are no religious individualists, no mystic anchorites, hermits, monks and the like, who constitute the real pinnacle in other religions. The prophets are not of these types. To be sure, they bear a burden which is laid upon them alone, but it is the burden of a message to the people. It is no way of salvation for their individual soul. They do not withdraw in order to be alone; but, burdensome as it is upon them, they go again and again to the people and attach themselves to it, running after others as the true shepherd after his wandering sheep, bearing its burden as their own and laying it as their own before God. That religion is a private affair is a mystical or idealistic concept, but it is never a Biblical idea. What binds man to God is the public pleading of the herald, and not an individual Yogi-practise or an individual philosophical way toward God. The service of God is public; what God will do is public. But in this very publicness the innermost is well guarded and unmistakably challenged. For this public word goes to the conscience of the individual.

In all, let this be emphasized in conclusion: the Old Testament is the beginning of the New. The beginning of the New. The difference between the Testaments should not be obliterated. The New Testament, the message of Jesus Christ, has fulfilled and in a certain sense also spiritualized all the thoughts which we have marked as characteristic of the Old Testament. But only "in a certain sense," and that does not mean in the modern or in the Greek sense of spirit. Yet there is one God, one message, one revelation, one Word, one covenant. If it now is called the New, it is not because it replaced the Old, but because it fulfills it. The New is that, through Jesus Christ, prophecy has begun to be fulfillment. Out of the Advent has come Christmas. But Advent and Christmas belong together. Ideas have no beginning and no end. The revelation of God, however, is only real in the totality of its events. To overthrow the Advent because we are now in Christ's Age is a sign that one has not understood what Christ's Age really is. So the understanding of the Old Testament is the criterion and the foundation for the understanding of the New.

IS BACH MUSIC LÜTHERAN?

EMANUEL W. HAMMER

Northport, Long Island, N. Y.

THE year 1946 marked the 400th anniversary of the death of Martin Luther, the greatest religious reformer of modern times. The year 1950 will mark the 200th anniversary of the death of the greatest church musician

of modern times, Johann Sebastian Bach. It is too early to venture any prediction concerning the nature of an anniversary observance. But it is reasonable to suppose that such an anniversary will not pass by without recognizing and evaluating Bach's extraordinary musical genius and his contribution to distinctively religious music.

The increasing interest in and presentation of Bach music, especially in the past decades, is very significant and highly encouraging. It was not always thus. There was a time, for some years after his death, when Bach's music was practically unknown. When the old master died there were very few people who seriously believed that his fame would outlive him. The alleged prediction of Moses Mendelssohn to the pessimistic Emanuel Bach that the music of the latter's father would again be cherished by later generations comes from a novelist of almost one hundred years ago. The statement would, however, not be inconsistent with Mendelssohn's interest in religious enlightenment and his appreciation of beauty in art, including musical art. Indeed, Bach's memory was still honored locally after his death by the pupils of his beloved Thomas School, of which he was the Cantor for more than twenty-five years. But that brief memorial service conducted annually on St. John's Day at Sebastian's grave was gradually abandoned as the expanding city of Leipzig encroached upon the sacred territory of St. John's cemetery.

Even during Bach's lifetime foreign influences were manifesting themselves in the realm of music. He himself had already encountered the light frivolous style of French music. Nor was he ignorant of the new florid Italian style. Perhaps he had a presentiment of the decline of church music as he busily etched the innumerable notes, beats, intervals and cadenzas on shiny copper plates. He was too poor to give his great work "The Art of Fugue" to an engraver. Laboriously he continued his etching that this masterpiece might not be lost to posterity. But who would buy or even listen to church music! That century was gradually erasing the idea of God. Why should it have any taste for hymns! The hopeless outlook must have saddened him deeply. The glaring copper plates burned his eyes. Before he succeeded in fettering his fugitive tone spirits he grew blind.

Times had changed and a new period had begun to dawn. After Bach's death his great influence was dissipated. His erstwhile most promising pupil and son, Friedemann, never measured up to the father's expectation. Influenced by Wolffianism, befogged by philosophical speculation and thwarted by an unhappy life, he was far from creating music comparable to his father's. Emanuel, the second son, though a successful musician, was similarly affected by the new intellectual atmosphere, so that he did not believe himself qualified to produce the kind of music his father had written.

The art of organ playing decreased rapidly. Choral music declined. People developed a taste for the flowery style of song such as had become

dominant in Italy and France. There was a growing desire for the theatrical rather than for the churchly style. Nor were there any composers interested in continuing the musical tradition of Bach. How great the decline was is indicated, for example, by the fact that Bach's *St. Matthew's Passion* was presented only three times in one hundred years! Its first performance occurred in *St. Thomas Church* at Leipzig on Good Friday, 15 April 1729. The second performance took place in 1740. Then eighty-nine years passed before it was performed for the third time in 1829 at Berlin under the direction of Felix B. Mendelssohn, who campaigned vigorously for a Bach appreciation.

The tide did turn. There has been a revival of interest in Bach music. In fact, there were beginnings of such revival soon after the downfall of the Napoleonic tyranny. The spirit of rationalism began to wane, and with the awakening of interest in a deeper phase of evangelical Christianity, the interest in genuine church music was also revived. These efforts were somewhat limited. However, church music associations in Germany gradually increased. A very encouraging forward step in this direction was the establishment of the New Bach Society in Leipzig in 1900. The purpose of the Society was to encourage better acquaintance with Bach music. In the course of time its value and beauty were also rediscovered in England. A little later a growing appreciation of Bach became evident in America. Increasingly Bach numbers were featured at organ recitals. Chorales, choral preludes, cantatas, oratorios, the *St. Matthew Passion*, the fugues, the *B Minor Mass* and the sonatas became better known. Transcriptions were made for symphony orchestras, and the number of Bach choral groups increased. Not only in England and America has this interest grown, but also in other lands. It is not uncommon to hear recordings of Bach music by distinguished musical groups in such countries as France, Spain and in Latin America. Even the Roman Catholic *Schola Cantorum* of Paris offers renditions of Bach's cantatas. The old master would be amazed to know how widely appreciated his music has become after the lapse of less than two centuries since his death.

Much has been said to indicate the possible reason for the power and beauty of Bach's imperishable works. It has been pointed out that he had imbibed the spirit of Mediaeval church music with all its contrapuntal scholasticism of tone. He was its lord and master. He not only reproduced it with all grace and appreciation of its value, he also breathed into it an incomparable spirit such as it had never before possessed. This soul was not the spirit of religion in general but the profound gospel faith which he had espoused with his whole being and creative inspiration. He lived in it, expressed it and interpreted it. The gospel was the soil from which his inspiration grew and bore choice fruitage. More than that. His music clearly reveals that Bach is a definite complement musically of the great religious

reformer. In all of Bach's church music we see the religious genius, fervor, joy, courage and fortitude of Martin Luther. His music speaks an uncompromising evangelical faith of Luther's type. Was it merely the reflection of his early religious training at home, or was it the result of maturer religious development? Perhaps a clue may be found in Bach's personal library.

In the State Archives in Dresden is a copy of the "Specificatio" of the estate of Johann Sebastian Bach "deceased 28 July 1750." The twelfth chapter of this document is of interest to us because it lists the books in the library of the deceased. The most interesting and illuminating catalog of books records fifty-two works composed of eighty-one books. The list, as given by H. Preuss, follows:

Calovii Schriften 3. Baende
 Lutheri Opera 7. Baende
 Idem Liber, 8. Baende
 Ej(usdem) Tischreden
 Ej. Examen Conc. Trid.
 Ej. Comment. ueber den Psalm 3ter Theil
 Ej. Hauss Postille
 Muelleri Schluss Kette
 Tauleri Predigten
 Scheubleri Gold-Grube, II Theile, 2. B.
 Pintingii Reise Buch der Heil Schrift
 Olearii Haupt Schluessel der gantzen Heil. Schrift, 3. B.
 Josephi Geschichte der Jueden
 Pfeifferi Apostolische Christen-Schule
 Ej. Evangelische Schatz Kammer
 Pfeifferi Ehe Schule
 Ej. Evangelischer Augapfel
 Ej. Kern und Safft der Heil S.
 Muelleri Predigten ueber den Schaden Josephs
 Ej. Schluss Kette
 Ej. Atheismus
 Ej. Judaismus
 Stengeri Postille
 Ej. Grundveste der Augspurg. Conf.
 Geyeri Zeit und Ewigkeit
 Rambachii Betrachtung
 Ej. Betrachtung ueber den Rath Gottes
 Lutheri Hauss Postille
 Froberi Psalm
 Unterschiedene Predigten
 Adami Gueldener Augapfel
 Meiffarti Erinnerung
 Heinischii Offenbarung Joh.
 Jauckleri Richtschnur der christlichen Lehre
 Francken Hauss Postilla

Pfeifferi Evangelische Christen Schule
 Ej. Anti Calvin
 Ej. Christenthum
 Ej. Anti-Melancholicus
 Rambachii Betrachtung ueber die Thraenen Jesu
 Muelleri Liebes Flamme
 Ej. Erquickstunden
 Ej. Rath Gottes
 Ej. Lutherus defensuſ
 Gerhardi Schola Pietatis 5. Baende
 Neumeisteri Tisch des Herrn
 Ej. Lehre von der Heil. Tauffe
 Speneri Eyfer wieder das Papstthum
 Hunnii Reinigkeiſt der Glaubens Lehre
 Klingii Warnung vor Abfall von der Luther. Relig.
 Arnds wahres Christenthum
 Wagneri Leipziger Gesang Buch, 8. Baende

Various comments might be made on the above list. But aside from the copyist's evident error in ascribing to Luther the authorship of the "Examen Concilii Tridentini" it may be stated in passing that most of these books are still known. A few cannot be traced. According to the terms of the will the books were distributed among the heirs, of whom there were twenty in all. It seems a bit humorous to discover that Bach's widow received among other items the three-volume work of Calovius. An eight year old girl inherited the eight-volume set of Luther's works. Strangely enough, not a single copy of the books listed has been located. We know that Bach was quite exact in his work. In the library of the Institute of Church Music in Berlin a copy of Frescobaldi's "Fiori" has been found with the inscription: "J. S. Bach 1714." Is it possible that he should have failed to enter his name in the books of the above list?

In looking over the titles in the catalog, the reader will probably be amazed to find titles lacking which one would expect to find. Where is the Bible? Where are the musical books? Where are his own musical compositions? Where is that cherished treasure Frescobaldi? Of course, the latter has been located, though it was not included in the catalog. Where is Picander, Neumeister, Salomo Franck? Most likely Bach's sons took possession of these works even before the listing was made. Indeed, Philip Emanuel must have obtained the lion's share. Some of the most precious works have been discovered elsewhere. For instance, it seems fairly certain that Philip Emanuel gave a number of them to the English historian of music, Charles Burney. In this manner Bach's library was evidently scattered all over. However, the catalog as given above is very significant.

Notice the preponderance of Luther's writings! Of the eighty-one vol-

umes, nineteen are by Luther. Whatever else is found in the titles is practically no more than an extension of Luther's faith, life and struggle. There are polemical books, devotional books and explanations of the Bible. Only occasionally is a trend toward pietism to be noticed.

A perusal of the dogmatic-polemical titles reveals three definite phases. First of all, there is the polemic against Roman Catholicism. This section is headed by the monumental work of Martin Chemnitz, "*Examen Concilii Tridentini*." Since Bach taught Latin in Leipzig it may be assumed that he possessed the Latin edition of the "*Examen*." In addition, there were two apologetical works, Pfeiffer's "*Evangelischer Augapfel*" and Stenger's "*Grundveste der Augspurgischen Confession*," besides Mueller's "*Lutherus defensus*."

In the second place, the titles in the realm of polemics also contain expressly anti-Calvinistic works. After all, Luther did inveigh against the non-Lutheran groups. There was no basis for union with the "Reformed." Pfeiffer's "*Anti-Calvin*" cannot tolerate any fellowship with the Reformed as far as articles of faith are concerned. Nor does Erdmann Neumeister, whose poetic work Bach used in his cantatas, erase the sharp line of demarcation between Lutheran and Reformed. No less positively does Johann Mueller reject the terrible doctrine of Predestination in his "*Rathschluss Gottes*."

In the third place, rationalism and atheism, which were already rearing their ugly heads, were severely attacked in Mueller's "*Atheismus*." The attack was occasioned by the rationalistic and atheistic writings emanating from France and England. They were directed against the Bible, Divine Providence, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection, the devil, conscience, the need of salvation in Christ, etc.

Is it not possible that Bach's quiet perusal of these books directly and indirectly influenced his music? We know that he had a wholesome, cheerful disposition and a childlike faith. But he also was temperamental and had had his struggles and even conflicts with others. But the deep solid undertone in his music is definitely of the Luther spirit. He also exhibited a religious polemics in his works. Albert Schweitzer has indicated the tone coloring in Bach, expressive of mood and emotions, as well as the deeprooted convictions of his faith. The certainty of faith is broadly underlined in the choral prelude to the chorale: "*Wir glauben all an einen Gott*." The rejection of atheism in the sense of Johann Mueller is discernible in the aria: "*Schweig, schweig nur, taumelnde Vernunft*" in the chorale, "*Wo Gott der Herr nicht bei uns haelt*."

On the other hand one must note the Lutheran devotional writings which essentially reflect Bach's piety. By these, as well as by the other books, Bach was solidly grounded in his "*Lutheranism*." He knew what it meant and what it represented. But the devotional literature in his library was, no

doubt, responsible for his close adherence to the Sunday texts in writing his cantatas. It is very difficult to understand these cantatas without knowing the background of their composition. Bach felt strangely compelled to complement the sermon by his cantatas. Is it too much to assume that the inspiration which he drew for his cantatas came from a careful reading of the pericopes? Let us adduce an example.

There is an undeniable relationship between the structure of Bach's cantata with the sermonic form of his day. In Rambach's "Betrachtungen," for instance, as we are informed, the sermon begins with an opening prayer. Then follows the text and the theme. That is very much like the opening choir and the following recitative of the cantata. Then follows the "applicatio." Human complaints and self-justification, God's appeal to the unbelieving, the affect of sympathetic love, God's gracious protection, etc. Are not all these the arias of the cantatas? The sermon closes with a prayer. Is that not the final chorus?

Moreover, Bach must have been deeply thrilled to find his Lutheran books enthusiastically championing the right of sacred music. There must have been a profound sense of gratitude in the master's heart toward his spiritual guides. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why we find the Postils in his library. For they contain, here and there, opposition to the Calvinistic rejection of good church music. Luther himself encouraged sacred music. He spoke most affectionately of "mistress musica" and brought her his offerings of tunes and poetic inspiration. Gifted men put into verse and hymn the deepest religious experiences common to genuine Christian believers. One need only mention the names of Paul Gerhardt, Salomo Franck, Johann Rist and many others. Little wonder then that Bach's library also contained Wagner's "Leipziger Gesangbuch" in eight volumes with about 5,000 hymns, from which Bach must have drawn additional inspiration for his music.

In view of the above it is fairly evident that Bach's library was not just so much more cumbersome household furniture but a tool which he used diligently. Whether he acquired personally the volumes of his library, or whether some volumes may have been presented to him as gifts, hardly alters the fact that his library was well chosen. Those books were a reflection of his own inner life and indicated his own simple faith and piety as well as his unmistakable yearning for that world where suffering and sorrow shall be unknown and where men shall sing unto the Lord out of the fulness of the Spirit. And music! Where is the glorious heavenly abode ever depicted without celestial music? In 1899 the noted New Testament scholar Theodor Zahn made this statement: "In yonder world into which the apostle John was permitted to gaze there are no informing lectures, no inspiring or boring sermons to hear; instead, there is an abundance of music."

AMONG THE NEW BOOKS¹

A Harmony of the Gospels. By Ralph D. Heim. Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1947. 209 pages. \$3.50.

This is the first Gospel harmony to appear on the basis of the text of the Revised Standard Version. The author, who is a graduate of Wittenberg College and Hamma Divinity School and a holder of the doctorate from Northwestern University, has been teaching in the biblical field for more than two decades. He occupies the chair of Christian Education and English Bible in Gettysburg Seminary. By training and experience in the classroom he is well qualified to prepare a study text of this character. His aim has been to provide a skillfully arranged harmony of the four Gospels for students.

As early as the second century A. D., students of the New Testament writings learned to appreciate the value of placing the materials of the Gospels in parallel columns for comparison and ready reference. The *Diatessaron* of Tatian (c. 173 A. D.) was one of the first attempts to combine the four Gospels. Since that time many such harmonies have appeared. In more modern times efforts have been made to perfect a harmony of the Synoptic Gospels quite apart from the use of the Gospel of John. However, there are values in having a work in which all four Gospels are combined.

Dr. Heim's volume offers many improvements over other harmonies. It not only combines all four Gospels in the text of the Revised Standard Version, but it also presents these materials in a significant, simplified arrangement, without employing extensive cross references and footnotes, and without duplications.

Bearing in mind Bible students of all ages and classes, the author adopts what he calls "a policy of severe simplification as compared with the usual harmonies." In dealing with the knotty problem of chronological sequence he avoids many difficulties by keeping the discourse material in the separate Gospels intact. His purpose is to lay stress on the gospel message of the life and teachings of Christ by giving the full account in a clear, combined form.

In his fresh approach to the Gospels Dr. Heim organizes the materials in three parts. Part One presents "Records of Christ's Early Life"; Part Two, "Records of Christ's Public Ministry"; and Part Three, "Records of Christ's Passion and Resurrection." The titles of the one hundred and thirty-two separate paragraphs of the outline appear usually in sentence form. This enables the reader to follow the account without difficulty.

Particularly useful is Dr. Heim's arrangement of indexes to principal parables, the Gospels of the Church Year, and the Gospel passages from Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John as they appear in their respective paragraphs or articles.

So superb is this up-to-date harmony of the Gospels for students that it will find a place not only in the classrooms of many high schools, colleges, universities, and seminaries, but also in public and private libraries and in hundreds of Christian homes throughout the land.

A debt of gratitude is due both Dr. Heim and the Muhlenberg Press in issuing this important publication.

E. E. FLACK

¹ Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be secured through the United Lutheran Publication House, 1228 Spruce Street, Philadelphia 7, Pa.

The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man: An Essay on Speculative Thought in the Ancient Near East. By H. and H. A. Frankfort, John A. Wilson, Thorkild Jacobsen, William A. Irwin. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1946. \$4.

The materials collected under the above title were first given in a course of lectures at the University of Chicago and the forceful literary style is doubtless due to that fact. The reader is not burdened or distracted by footnotes—the relatively few notes are appended to the several chapters. So well is the work done that were it not for the change of subject matter there would be little indication of composite authorship. Here is a sample of a cooperative enterprise in the study and assessment of life in the ancient world that could profitably be employed elsewhere.

The content of the book falls naturally into three divisions—Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Hebrews—with introductory and concluding chapters. The Frankforts are responsible for the latter and in their first chapter deal with the significance of myth and its relation to reality. Speculative thought, according to the writers, is concerned with the vital problems of man such as his nature and destiny. The ancients were as interested in those matters as we are today, only they were unhampered by “scientific search for truth” and were materially aided by a general lack of distinction between the natural and human realms. “The ancients . . . saw man always as a part of society, and society as imbedded in nature and dependent upon cosmic forces” (p. 4). They moved in the sphere of experience and imagination rather than in that of pure thought. The vehicle of their thought was myth which was often dramatized with singular effectiveness. An example of such dramatization was the reenactment of the victory of Marduk over the forces of chaos at the Babylonian New Year festival at which time the epic of creation was recited. “Myth is a form of poetry which transcends poetry in that it proclaims a truth; a form of reasoning which transcends reasoning in that it wants to bring about the truth it proclaims; a form of action, of vital behavior which does not find its fulfilment in the act but must proclaim and elaborate a poetic form of truth” (p. 8). Mythopoeic thought is quite “logical” in that it has its categories of causality, space, and time, each of which is interpreted in the concrete. Ancient man always included emotional and volitional elements in his attempts to understand the problems of life. The result was not a critical judgment but the postulation of varied and complex images.

The first illustration of “The Intellectual Adventure of Ancient Man” is presented by Professor Wilson. What did the Egyptians think about the world and man? They were, of course, limited by their perspective and, though they were very much aware of the world, it was in essence an *Egyptian* world. The limits of their experience are made evident by every text. There was therefore a circumscribed world built around the Nile with emphasis upon the periodicity of life. That view of the universe had a marked effect upon the organization of men, if it can be called such. The chief factor in the world was the gods of whom the king was the official representative. Men were “the cattle of the gods” and the king was the herdsman who exercised “a balance of force and tender care” over them. And while law and precedent were generally the guiding principles in dealing with people, the king as a god could himself issue commands and orders. The values of life center about two poles, i.e. material existence in this world and the after-life, both of which are apparent from the monuments and inscriptions. The great contributions of Egypt were its sense of appreciation of former times and places and its monumental achievements.

Professor Jacobsen's section on Mesopotamia is of equal interest and of perhaps greater significance because of the well-known relationship between the Hebrews and the people

of the "two rivers." While the monuments of Egypt still stand, those of Mesopotamia "have become heaps." That fact speaks volumes, for the Egyptian prided himself on his time-resisting works whereas the Mesopotamian thought little about his works because the "meaning of existence always lay beyond man and his achievements, beyond tangible things, in intangible powers ruling the universe" (p. 125). For the latter the cosmos was a state, a primitive democracy. Everything in nature was animate—a thou—and with man and animals composed the citizenry of the cosmic state. The relative importance of that citizenry was determined by position and power. The divine assembly with its order of gods, e.g. Anu, Enlil, Enki, was modeled after the earthly state. The various functions of the members of the divine assembly as portrayed in Mesopotamian literature are given in some detail and with exceptional clarity. So far as this world is concerned, one basic fact must be remembered, i.e. that man was made for the gods and hence their welfare and not his own must remain primary. Hence the old city states were the estates of the gods and were run for the latter's private benefit. The national state was the province of a great god who was an official of the cosmic state. "According to the view of the world as a state, man is the slave of the great cosmic forces; he serves them and obeys them; and his only means of influencing them is by prayer and sacrifice, that is, by persuasion and gifts" (p. 200). On the basis of such a world view and conception of man, one is not surprised that the greatest stress was placed on the virtue of obedience and its rewards. With the growing power of the state came the demand for justice in the world, the denial of which led to pessimism and despair and finally to the collapse of the state.

The third of the great civilizations of antiquity flourished on Palestinian soil. Its ideas and beliefs are discussed by Professor Irwin. The Hebrew world was in a sense the heir of Egypt and Mesopotamia. Israel came upon the scene comparatively late, and contact with the twin foci of ancient culture appears on almost every page of the Old Testament. But while Israel took over many of the thought forms and institutions of her neighbors, she enriched them by her own experience which centered about her conception of God, man and the nation. Her great contribution to the world was the idea of one God, the creator of the world and man, and who dwelt eternally in the heavens. Man was created in his image. Since the world and man were created by God, the Hebrews laid particular emphasis on this life and little, until very late, upon the future life as may be seen from the book of Job. Israel's supremacy lay in her thinking. "They (the Hebrews) were far overshadowed by Egypt and Babylon; Assyria trod them down at will. But Israel has lived in the faith and thought and conduct of succeeding centuries, a heritage that grows ever richer, while her proud contemporaries are a faded memory. . . . In her achievements she stood head and shoulders above the best of her oriental contemporaries at their highest outreach. . . . Their basic convictions on the ultimate character of the world, their view of the nature and place of man, their social ideals, and their political principles have become so large a part of our common heritage today . . . that with full recognition of the profound contributions of Greece and Rome one may well question whether any other nation has so profoundly influenced the course of human life or has contributed comparable impulse to the thought and action of our day" (pp. 358f.).

The concluding chapter takes us to the western world, to the emancipation of thought from myth, and furnishes us a glimpse of the ideas of early Greek philosophers about God, the world, and man. One could wish that the great philosophers and poets of the fifth century had been brought within the purview of the authors.

Such is but a very inadequate synopsis of the content of this remarkable book. No

one who wishes to understand the origin and development of speculative thought in the ancient world can afford to neglect this first class discussion.

J. M. MYERS

Revelation and Reason. By Emil Brunner, translated by Olive Wyon. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946. 440 pages. \$4.50.

There are those who are of the opinion that American theology ought to go its own independent way and not rely on foreign importations. While it is true that we have our own peculiar problems which will not be solved for us by outsiders, yet it would be the height of folly not to be willing to learn from anyone anywhere in the whole wide world who has something to say on the basic human problems. American Lutherans have been particularly slow in profiting from European developments. In fact, all of Lutheranism has allowed those outside of the Lutheran tradition to do much more with the great Lutheran heritage that stems directly from the great Reformer than it has done itself. Brunner's latest book to appear in English translation is another evidence of what theology owes to Luther, and, in particular, also to Soeren Kierkegaard.

The present interest in Kierkegaard in this country is regarded by many as a mere fad. And, indeed, it is just that for many who, like the Athenians, having suffered the collapse of their philosophies, are eagerly looking about for some new thing. Nevertheless, the influence of Kierkegaard will continue to assert itself and will continue to spark the reformation stirring the church today. Kierkegaard's fighting words that Christianity is to be simply proclaimed boldly and triumphantly and is not to be defended pusillanimously are at last being heeded. One is tempted to say that the tide has already turned, and that the disastrous reign of a synthetic philosophy-theology is over. Of course, there are still a great many die-hards and there always will be. Some time ago when militant fundamentalists were frantically defending their faith, Walter Lippmann (*Preface to Morals*) regarded their antics as the sign that they themselves were no longer sure of themselves. One who is confident of his position does not do quite so much shouting. Today, the frantic shouting, the anxious faint-hearted forebodings of what the world is coming to at the hands of those who really recognize only one Lord, seems all on the side of those whose confidence in reason has been, in spite of themselves, so rudely shaken. (See A. Campbell Garnett's review of *Revelation and Reason* in *The Christian Century* for January 22, 1947.) While they are defending the last battlements of a lost cause, an ever increasing number are in the very name of reason going over to the side of revelation where the real constructive work is going on.

The present volume again shows the great influence of Kierkegaard which is apparent in all of Brunner's work. It is at the same time an answer to that interpretation of Kierkegaard which would make him an advocate of the rankest kind of irresponsible emotionalism. The thesis of this book, that revelation is self-authenticating and that there is no understanding of the Christian position except with the eyes of God-wrought faith is the thesis which Kierkegaard so ardently defended as did Luther before him. A man is taken possession of in his existence by the God of revelation, he is transformed, he gives up his autonomy, and hence recognizes his true Lord. This is the very meaning of revelation, that God himself must grant the condition for recognizing the revelation. After that, and even during the process of coming to faith, in as much as a man does not stop reasoning, the reason comes fully into play, but it is no longer the autonomous reason. It is rather the reason at once held captive and set free by the miracle of its encounter with God. Hence the title of the book with revelation preceding reason. And Brunner, after he has shown how revelation is primary, goes to great lengths to show also the legitimate

sphere of reason. There is room and unquestioned need for Christian philosophers who, as Christians held in subjection by revelation, "bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Jesus Christ," will examine and make use of all that scientific investigation has to offer. Philosophy is not the handmaiden of theology, but both philosophy and theology are, correctly understood, secular pursuits, that is, areas in which the general priesthood of believers is to function. Theology is no more a sacrosanct formulation of infallible truth than is philosophy. Theology is man's, that is, the Christian believer's, attempt to state to his generation the revelation that was given once and for all. And Christian philosophy is just carrying this a step further, so to speak, by trying to build up a world view that is consistent with revelation. Much of what the Christian philosopher thus plays around with in his thoughts may be quite inconsequential, but there will be vast aspects of it that come to grips with all the basic problems of existence where the Christian philosopher, meaning nothing other than a Christian who also loves wisdom, will have an answer.

The crux of the whole matter is put by Brunner in these words: "The dangerous gulf does not lie between the theologian and the philosopher, but between the act of faith, on the one hand, and the process of thinking about it, on the other—whether these reflections are theological or philosophical in character (p. 390). It all depends, therefore, on whether or not a man has experienced "faith." Having experienced faith he may go on to philosophize to the glory of God. If he has not experienced faith all his philosophizing will not arrive at the Christian conclusions.

Vital at this point also is Brunner's recognition of the distinction between what Kierkegaard calls religiosity A, the universally humane religiosity, and religiosity B, the specifically Christian, paradoxical religiosity. The former, at its best, represents the heights of what man, on the basis of the witness God has left in creation, in virtue of the *imago dei* he still retains, is able to achieve. This is good for what it is good for; it always provides a point of contact for the Christian revelation, but it is also inevitably corrupted by sin and, therefore, does not stand in need of supplementation only, but of radical correction by means of that Christian revelation. It still is true that the insights of the Christian religion are not at the disposal of sinful man because of some inherent powers, but they must be introduced, that is, begotten in a man, by the Teacher, who is more than a Socratic midwife.

The book is divided into two parts, in the first of which the nature of revelation is fully presented. Section one develops the concept of revelation showing its unique, self-authenticating character. Section two discusses the original revelation in creation as the basis for the historical revelation in the Old Covenant as promise, and in Jesus Christ as fulfillment. Following this is the presentation of the revelation in the witness to the revelation in the Holy Scriptures, the Church, and the Spirit. The conclusion of this section treats of revelation as fulfillment in Glory.

Part II is entitled, "The truth of the revelation," and deals with the counterclaims that have been made to revelation and the objections raised to the Christian claim. The religions of the world, naturalistic theories of religion, higher criticism, science and the miracle of revelation, the Logos, the moral law of reason, the proof of the existence of God, atheism, pantheism, speculative idealism, deism, agnosticism, positivism, theism, all come in for a fair, objective appraisal. The book ends on the note of "repentance," which is the *sine qua non* of admission into the Kingdom. "Repentance is accomplished in an act of reason, but in such a way that in it the reason loses its autonomy. Reason is able to do this only because it has been conquered by the Word of God, but this conquest takes place in acts of the reason, in a meta-noia, in a transformation of our thought about ourselves and about God, in an understanding of what God is saying to us. . . ." The auto-

mous self abdicates. It listens to its Lord. It is no longer the master but the servant. "Thus Christ conquers the reason and in so doing makes it free" (p. 430).

This book must be considered essential reading for friend and foe alike. While Lutherans may feel that Brunner, along with many others, lacks the proper appreciation of the Lutheran view of the Sacraments which is under fire today, they will not, I believe, find anything in the present volume which would not be in complete harmony with Luther's spirit. This, however, will not apply if one is concerned about defending an obscurantist theory of inspiration.

A few questions in conclusion. The one concerns a reference to Kierkegaard's speaking of revelation as an "incognito," as when "sometimes in legends a king will wander through his country in the incognito of a beggar." It is true that Kierkegaard does speak of the Kenosis of the Son of man as an incognito, but he also says that it is not an incognito, and he is most careful to distinguish the divine incognito from what is ordinarily regarded as such, where the incognito is only a disguise which a sufficiently discerning person might penetrate. In the Incarnation, God really became a true man. This is the absolute paradox which nothing but the eyes of 'faith' can penetrate. "But this servant-form is no mere outer garment, like the king's beggar cloak, which, therefore, flutters loosely about him and betrays the king; it is not like the filmy summer-cloak of Socrates, which, though woven of nothing yet both conceals and reveals. It is his true form and figure. For this is the unfathomable nature of love, that it desires equality with the beloved, not in jest merely but in earnest and in truth" (Phil. Frag., p. 24). Also: "All romancing and trumpeting abroad about one's cleverness in penetrating God's incognito, though without receiving the condition from the Teacher; that one took notice of him by the impression he made, such a feeling coming over one in his presence; that there was a something in his voice and mien, etc. etc.,—all this is but silly twaddle, by which one does not become a disciple but only makes a mockery of God. The servant-figure was no incognito. And when in the strength of his omnipotent resolve, which is like his love, God makes himself the equal of the humblest, let no innkeeper or professor of philosophy imagine that he is a shrewd enough fellow to detect anything, unless God gives the condition. And when God in the form of a servant stretches forth the hand of omnipotence, let no astonished and open-mouthed beholder imagine that he is a disciple because he is astonished, and because he can gather others about him who in their turn are astonished over his story (*Ibid.*, p. 52).

The whole point about which Brunner is concerned would be lost if the absolute impenetrability of the divine incognito by the natural man is not maintained. The display of glory that bursts forth in Christ's life, as, for example, in his miracles, always presents also the possibility of "offense." The Pharisees, for example, accuse him of driving out the demons by Beelzebub. The unrepentant see only the "astounding"; the believers see the miracle. With this Brunner must certainly be in agreement, yet certain of his statements are misleading (p. 186).

There is also a reference to Kant which may be open to question. Kant's refutation of the ontological argument is asserted to be the weakest part of his philosophy (p. 343). Kant himself is said to have employed the ontological argument, "When he sees in the fact of the moral law within us the inevitability of the idea of God" (p. 344). But that certainly is not Anselm's ontological argument, which is the one that Kant refuted. The crux of Anselm's argument hinges on whether or not existence is a quality. If existence is not, as Kant maintains, a quality, then obviously the idea of a perfect being does not imply its existence any more than the idea of the famous one hundred dollars, and Kant's refutation is conclusive. Besides, Kant nowhere maintains the inevitability of the idea of God in the sense of the ontological proof as implied by the indubitable cer-

tainty of the moral law within. In the interests of logical consistency, the ideas of God, freedom, and immortality are the *postulates* of the practical reason. This makes of Kant a rationalist, but it is scarcely to be regarded as employing the ontological argument.

M. J. HEINECKEN

Man as Sinner in Contemporary American Realistic Theology. By Mary Frances Thelen. New York: King's Crown Press, 1946. xii, 224 pages. \$2.75.

One of the most significant recent developments in American theology has been the turn from a superficial unchristian view of man and his sin toward a fuller appreciation of the depth and the vitality of the Christian doctrine which sees man as created in God's image, corrupted by sin, and redeemed by Christ. This book by the Assistant Professor of Religion in Hollins College, Virginia, furnishes thorough documentary proof of that trend. It is not an original systematic study but an objective analysis of the thought of selected "realistic" theologians and of the views which they have rendered untenable.

For a background of the new "realism" the author presents F. R. Tennant as the representative of a liberal theology to which sin was only a biological survival or spiritual lag; W. E. Hocking as the representative of a philosophical idealism which justified sin as an aspect of moral education; and H. S. Elliott as the representative of a religious education which specifically rejected the doctrine that man is a sinner. This account is supplemented with a presentation of two popular secular theories, the Marxian concept which locates man's fall in the division of labor and the beginning of the class struggle, and the Freudian identification of original sin with fall into neurosis. "Freud and Marx stand apart from the liberals in that they were presiding geniuses at the birth of realistic theology before they were outdistanced in pessimism concerning man's virtue by the new movement" (p. 58).

Such is the setting for the central content of the book, the exposition of the hamartiology of five contemporary American theologians: Reinhold Niebuhr, Walter M. Horton, Robert L. Calhoun, John C. Bennett, and Richard Niebuhr. The first named of course is considered most important and he is accorded more space than all the others put together. Those who need an interpreter in order to grasp Reinhold Niebuhr's systematic thinking will perhaps find nowhere else a more clear, concise, and balanced summary of his basic theology. The author has made a painstakingly thorough study of all the published writings of the five "realists" and quotes from them extensively and discriminatingly. Discussion of the doctrine of sin affords numerous opportunities for presenting the related doctrines of God, man, and nature, which the author utilizes to give a fairly complete theological portrait of each of the thinkers selected.

The new "realism" on man as a sinner is in many respects a revival of the classical Protestantism of the Reformation. Lack of familiarity with original Reformation sources, however, leads the author, and at times the writers she discusses, to some curious errors. Thus Horton is given credit for the figure of the "two hands of God," an expression of the dualism of divine love and judgment, while actually the figure is borrowed from Luther who used it to convey precisely the same thought. Nor is there any adequate recognition that the doctrine of "the sins of the righteous," held by Reinhold Niebuhr, Calhoun, and others, is nothing more than Luther's "*simul iustus et peccator*." When the author agrees with Reinhold Niebuhr that "the Lutheran teaching of equal sinfulness without recognition of degrees of guilt" is wrong (p. 187), she, like Niebuhr himself, fails to distinguish between the point of view of justification and the point of view of sanctification in Lutheran thought.

When the author points out that the new "realistic" theology "sees the experience of grace primarily as consoling us for the failure of our best efforts and only secondarily as

resulting in moral improvement" (p. 168), she has exposed the Achilles heel of that entire theology. Such vulnerability could be avoided by a genuine return to Luther's dynamic and constructive teaching on grace.

T. A. KANTONEN

What Must the Church Do? By Robert S. Billheimer. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947. 148 pages. \$1.

The purpose of this volume is to summarize the findings of the previous four volumes of "The Interseminary Series." The author fathered the creation of this work and is eminently prepared to present the summary and challenge contained in this concluding volume.

The characteristics of the present age are described as an obsession for power and achievement by organized and unorganized groups at the expense of the individual personality; the absence of a spiritual unity of society; destructive personal tensions; and the dominance of the economic motive.

It is the author's contention that the church has the unique possession and function to heal, guide, and create the "whole" individual and the wholesome society. The church's responsibility is to function for *all* men.

Part three presents the process, the vehicles and the significance of a profound ecumenical reformation now going on in the church. Some of the evidences of this reformation are community of theological thought, vitality of worship, world-evangelism, comprehensive approach to social problems, and the strategy of developing churches which are indigenous to the culture of the peoples in their communities.

The concluding section of the book describes the task before the church and the call to its fulfillment. "The Interseminary Series" affords an opportunity for the student and worker in the church to acquaint himself with contemporary Christian thinking and arouse himself to effective pioneering in Kingdom service.

HARVEY D. HOOVER

We Found Them Waiting. By Theodore P. Fricke. Columbus: The Wartburg Press, 1947. 123 pages.

In the post-war world the question of Missions is, Where do we start from now? In this booklet we have an answer to the question as far as it pertains to work on the northern side of the eastern part of New Guinea. It will be remembered that this is where the Japanese struck very early in the war and from that point on they had to be turned back. One of the most touching parts of this booklet is the picture of seventeen missionaries added to the roll of martyrs from this field alone. Has there been any field in which the martyr roll was larger?

Other illustrations show the havoc caused by the war to Mission hospitals, schools and dwellings, not a small part of the destruction being due to our own fire, since the Japanese had to be dislodged from their positions. Yet out of all this devastation comes the hopeful sentence, almost a theme of the book, "The Mission has been destroyed but the Church stands."

This field has been one of the most successful of modern mission fields. It also has been the one that has had to suffer most from the effects of two world wars. In the first it suffered the removal of most of its missionaries. This part of New Guinea was up to that war under Germany, and the Rhenish and Neuendettelsan Societies had done noble pioneer work there. After the war American and Australian Lutherans helped, taking over part of the work. Then in the Second World War this became the scene

of its earliest and severest conflict. Ten thousand American soldiers lie buried there. It was here that the Fuzzy-Wuzzies befriended many an American doughboy. It sounds very heroic. But what must be the effect on people just rescued from a stage of barbarism to be called on to endure the greater destructive powers of a so-called Christian civilization!

The American Lutheran Church, together with the Australian United Lutheran Church, had a station of its own before the Second World War, and now through the National Lutheran Council is on the way of becoming responsible for all of it. Dr. Fricke on behalf of the American Lutheran Church made a visitation and wrote letters of what he found there. These are given permanent form in this booklet. Perhaps the reviewer can express his valuation of the book in no better way than by expressing the hope that all other post-war visitors to Mission fields may give us equally graphic and instructive accounts of what they found there.

JOHN ABERLY

Everyman's Adventure. By Merle William Boyer. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947. 172 pages. \$2.50.

We human beings have the happy privilege, rich opportunity, and inescapable responsibility to learn to know God as he is revealed in Jesus Christ—to learn to know his way of life. Included in this is learning how to help others to realize their God-given destiny. To escape futility and defeat we must learn how to make life meaningful and masterful.

Everyman's Adventure is a stimulating and suggestive series of reflections upon the life of the church. The policy and program of the contemporary church are presented as an intriguing adventure. We are persuaded that it is a glorious adventure. The church is God's adventure with man.

In "adventuring with God" the author touches upon the theme of God in history. In adventuring without God" we are introduced to the pathology of adventuring and led to the conclusion that "no man can live without God and be completely man." These two chapters deal with the sickness of modern civilization in a comprehensive and yet compact fashion.

The adventuring church is preeminently both a worshipping and a prophetic, ethically dynamic church. Failure to be the body of Christ, the instrument of God's great adventure with man is the great heresy of the church. Here is a challenge to vitalize worship, acquire new insight into theology and develop a dynamic ethic in individual and social life.

While it is true that "life is infinitely complex and mysterious, and that a venture of faith is necessary and inevitable," it is also true that there are adequate resources for the adventurer in Christian living, and the possibility of experiential certainties. The fields and resources for adventuring are presented in six chapters of vital interest to every citizen, but especially to every churchman seeking to be and live the Christian way of life.

Adventuring in worship demands the sense of awe and reverence in the presence of the Infinite, an attitude of ethical awareness, an awareness of the depths of man's sinfulness and of the reach of God's loving grace and forgiveness. "A church that has lost an objective sacramental element in its worship cannot remain a church over many generations." Mysticism is one of the great sources of religious motivation for many personalities, but "both Christian thought and Christian living are necessary for a fully rounded Christian experience." There is need of rethinking the doctrines of the Holy Spirit and the Word of God if there is to be a revival of worship in Protestant churches.

The problem of the unity of the church is presented from its several viewpoints. The author concludes this thoughtful chapter thus: "With the presence of the Holy Spirit we are confident that the church will successfully resist efforts of dictatorial unionism. It is

the hope of most Christians that church union in America will follow the paths of co-operative unity rather than protective union."

The subjects of "Adventuring in Ethics—Beyond Authoritarianism" and "Adventuring in Ethics—Beyond Relativism" are presented in a logical manner. The treatment is psychologically and theologically sound. The essay is necessarily brief but illuminating and penetrating.

The pastoral function shines out clearly in the chapters dealing with "Lonely Souls" and the problem of evil. Adventuring with lonely souls and "into the darkness and depth" begins with case studies from a pastor's notebook. In both there is manifest a sympathetic understanding of human need, and of the church's method of meeting that need.

The book reaches its climax in the chapter on "Adventuring in Social Action." The church must face its task today in this field with great faith and zeal. The author insists that reinvigoration of Christianity depends "on coming to terms with the vertical axis of faith, the I-Thou relationship existing between God and man." But he also asserts that "to neglect the horizontal phases of its task at this critical moment is to betray the highest historical task a church can have, namely, the task of redirecting civilization at a critical moment."

I close this appreciation of this fresh statement of an old theme by quoting the opinion of Dr. Halford C. Luccock regarding this book: "It is vivid in its picturesque writing, remarkable in its knowledge of the whole church situation, and shrewd and penetrating in its suggestions as to program and policy. More than that, it is delightful to read."

H. D. HOOVER

Greater Love Hath No Man. By Martin Walker and Theophil H. Schroedel. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1947. 106 pages. \$1.25.

In preparation for the season of Lent there appear annually from our publication houses volumes of sermons and meditations with the purpose of stimulating and inspiring our pastors in their Lenten preaching. *Greater Love Hath No Man* is one such work, containing two series of sermons, "Christ for Us and in Us," by the Reverend Martin Walker of Buffalo, New York, and "Old Testament types of Christ," by the Reverend Theophil Henry Schroedel of Minneapolis, Minnesota.

It is unfortunate that two series of such unequal worth should be included in one volume. They are both written in a biblical tradition, but where one succeeds, the other fails. Mr. Schroedel's sermons on Old Testament types do not have a clear, coherent development, nor do they succeed in bringing the Christian message realistically and forcefully to the reader. The difficulty lies in his approach to the biblical record. One must question the value of considering the work of redemption in the light of Old Testament typology, for while Christ may be found in the Old Testament, it is scarcely by allegorizing the offering of Isaac and the rock in the wilderness. Joseph and his brethren may be an illustration of Jesus' forgiveness, but it is difficult to see how this story is one of "a great many incidents, facts, and objects in the Old Testament which have direct reference to Christ and His redemptive work," or, how it and the other of these types "find their fulfillment in the life and death of our Lord" (p. 60).

The author of the other series accomplishes his task more successfully. Mr. Walker has chosen as the basis for his sermons the characteristics of Jesus demonstrated in the passion—his courage, submission, patience, silence, compassion, love and death. By dividing each sermon into two parts he emphasizes what Christ has accomplished through these for us, and shows the reader how this activity of Jesus must create a response in us. In this way the series represents sound biblical preaching, at once scriptural and realistic.

R. BORNEMANN